THE

JEWISH & CHRISTIAN CHURCHES:

OR,

THE HEBREW CONGREGATION

AND

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

DISTINCT ORGANIZATIONS.

By ADIEL SHERWOOD, D. D.

SECOND EDITION, IMPROVED AND ENLARGED.

ST. LOUIS:
PRINTED BY USTICK, STUDLEY & CO.

1854.

JI

THE

JEWISH & CHRISTIAN CHURCHES:

OR

THE HEBREW CONGREGATION

AND

CHRISTIAN CHURCH

DISTINCT ORGANIZATIONS.

By ADIEL SHERWOOD, D. D.

SECOND EDITION, IMPROVED AND ENLARGED.

ST. LOUIS:
PRINTED BY USTICK, STUDLEY & CO.

1854.

ADVERTISEMENT TO SECOND EDITION.

Our edition of 500 copies, published in March 1850, was soon exhausted, and another called for before the expiration of the year. The author had neither time nor intention to publish another, hoping the Publication Societies would relieve him from the necessity; but as they have not, and loud calls are made in several quarters for the work, he yields to their calls. Some fifteen to twenty pages have been added.

Cape Girardeau, Mo., January, 1854.

CONTENTS.

——o——

DEDUCTIONS.

—o—

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

INTRODUCTION.

It is of the greatest importance, that in our church polity we should be guided solely by the Scriptures. Protestants profess to take these as the only authoritative umpire in matters of faith and practice. But it must be conceded that the Christian world has diverged very far from the unerring standard—that in forming creeds and formulas of doctrine and government, we have mingled with Bible teachings, the commandments and inferences of men. Primitive Christianity, unincumbered by rites and ceremonies, which proud and ambitious dignitaries have introduced for the sake of honor and filthy lucre, was cordial in its obedience and simple in its forms of worship. It inquired, "What saith the Scripture?" and bowed submissively to its decisions. Speaking of the Albigenses, an early Christian sect that was separate from "the mother church," Heinius, a Catholic writer, observes, that "they held that the Holy Scriptures are the only source of faith and religion, without regard to the authority of the Fathers or tradition." When we return to inspired directions, and admit them only to be authoritative in faith and practice and church polity, schisms and disputes will cease—party names will be lost, and the uniform exclamation of the world will be, "Behold how these Christians love one another!"

SECTION I. The identity of the Church under the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, it is conceived, is a great mistake, and has been the source of serious errors in ecclesiastical matters. This theory has been maintained by very learned and distinguished men, but it is destitute of Scriptural proof. Let us quote authors: "The perpetuity of the Abrahamic Covenant, and of consequence the *identity* of *the Church** under

---

* We use the word *Church* as established among the Jews to avoid circumlocution, but *congregation* is the proper phrase. The word *Church*, in the English version, is not found in the Old Testament. Church and congregation are words in common use among us—the one meaning the professed followers of Christ—the other the regular attendants on the ministry, but acknowledging that they are not suitable candidates for Church membership. The same Greek word (*ecclesia*) is found in the Septuagint, which is used to describe the Christian Church in the New Testament; but when reference is had to the Old Testament usage, it should have been translated *congregation* instead of *church*, had not King James ordered otherwise. The translators perceived there was an evident distinction to be made between the Jewish nation and a body of believers in Christ. When the word refers to Old Testament times, it presents to our minds a nation consisting of all classes and kinds of persons—some pious and believing—others immoral in their lives and openly infidel in sentiment. But no intelligent reader of the New Testament has such apprehensions when he meets with *church* as used by Christ as his representative on earth and propagator of his religion. We always regard it as comprising a body of believers, regenerated by the Holy Spirit — united together in a spiritual relation —*called out* of the mass of the people and devoted to the service of God. In describing the Jewish congregation, we describe a nation;—a Christian Church implies a select number of pious persons with the vows of Christ upon them to believe and practice his doctrines and precepts. Who, in reading in Acts 19th, 29 to 40 verses, when the whole city was filled with confusion—the assembly (*ecclesia*) was confused; or in Psalm xxvi. 5: "I have hated the congregation (*ecclesia*) of evil doers," would suppose a Christian Church is described? Beside church, the word is used for an assembly of men run-

both dispensations, is so plainly taught in the Scriptures," &c. (*a*) "The covenant with Abraham being in reality the *gospel covenant*, set forth in types and figures according to the manner of ancient times, may we not, from the use and efficacy of circumcision, believe that baptism, the rite of initiation into the Christian Church, is like it, a seal of the gospel covenant, and a declaration on the part of God that he will count the faith of the baptized person for righteousness?" (*b*) "Christ's baptism was designed regularly to introduce him into his priestly office according *to the law of Moses*, under which he commenced his ministry, and which it behoved him to fulfill." (*c*) "If God shall succeed and bless your labors of love among the heathen, you will establish churches, break to them the bread of life, *and apply* the seals of the covenant to the children and domestics of believers, agreeably to the practice of Abraham." (*d*)

For centuries the opinions above have been entertained by the great majority of the Christian world, *i. e.* that the Christian Church being the same in nature and object as the Jewish Theocracy and a continuation of that early organization, had taken its place — that they are one and the same thing, only under different dispen-

---

ning together in a tumultuous manner. In Acts vii. 38, the word should be translated *congregation*.

(*a*) Dr. Miller, of Princeton.
(*b*) Dr. McKnight, of Scotland.
(*c*) Dr. Samuel Worcester, Salem, Massachusetts.
(*d*) Dr. Spring, Newburyport, Mass., in an address to Judson, Newell, &c., about to sail as missionaries to India, in 1812.

sations. It is freely admitted that *religion* has ever been the same, the love and adoration of the heart for its Maker, and whether under the first or second covenant, the man that feared and obeyed God is accepted of Him: yet this does not prove that the elements of the former are identical with the latter, or similar to them. There are points of resemblance, it is conceded, and this resemblance has misled us, and engendered the supposition that the two dispensations are one and the same organization, though in different ages.

Pedo-baptism perpetuates this theory, in order, it is maintained, to secure the salvation of children. Misled by its supposed favorable bearing on the infants of professing Christians, the illogical inference is deduced, that as the descendants of Abraham, which submitted to circumcision, were embraced in the early covenant made with the Patriarch, so those of believers which have been dedicated to God in baptism, are entitled to all the blessings of the covenant of grace!

But this takes for granted what is not taught. The covenant with Abraham was not the covenant of grace, for as Mr. Buck justly observes, "the covenant of grace, properly speaking, could not be made between God and man; for what can man restipulate, which is in his power to do or give Him?" In the covenant with Abraham, God promises great temporal blessings, a numerous progeny, the land of Canaan, and that Messiah should descend from his family; but not that all his circumcised posterity should be saved. Neither Ishmael, nor the sons by Ketu-

rah, nor Esau, ever supposed that a pious seed would descend from them because they were descendants of the Patriarch. "Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they *all children*, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called: That is, they which are the children of *the flesh*, these are not the children of God."—(Rom. ix. 7, 8.) The natural descendants of Abraham, Ishmael, and others, are not the children of God and heirs to the land of Canaan; through Isaac and Jacob, eminent for their piety, the Redeemer is to come. But if circumcision had conveyed the favor of God, Ishmael had been as pious as they. But it did not and could not secure the operation of faith in children any more than baptism.

But if what is claimed by Pedo-baptists, and affirmed as a just inference from the premises, could be proved, this would furnish a right only to Abraham's descendants; Gentile nations, as we are, could derive no benefit from a covenant made with the root of the Jewish nation. If we could trace our descent from the Father of the Faithful, the case would stand differently, and we might lay claim to the land of Canaan. But it is as absurd for us to claim benefits promised to Jews, as for an Asiatic to demand a part in a legacy bequeathed to an English family. "There is no evidence in the New Testament," says Dr. Emmons, "that believers are now in the covenant of circumcision, but clear evidence to the contrary." A believing Jew might plead the covenant with the friend of God, but none other; for Abraham was a believer long before he was circumcised: "and he received the sign of circumcision," a mark in his own flesh, as

God's seal "of the righteousness of the faith which he *had in uncircumcision*," &c. Rom. iv. 11. "Faith counted for righteousness," says McKnight, "is called the blessing of Abraham to come on the Gentiles through Christ"—"that he might be the father of all them who *believe*, whether *in* or *out* of the *visible church*." His posterity also was circumcised, but derived no spiritual benefit at all from it, unless they became *believers*, as we have seen in Ishmael and other circumcised but impenitent Jews. So it is with baptism — there is no more connection between it and saving faith, than between circumcision and faith. The rite was a seal of Abraham's faith, but not to any other person — for many received the rite, who gave no evidence that they were *believers:* they lived the *circumcised* foes to God and holiness.

SECTION II. Let us look at the *Jewish congregation.* It was composed of those *males* which had been circumcised, and could count their descent from Abraham. If the man could show from the records his relation to the Patriarch, and the evidence of his obedience to the divine direction, he was a part of the community in all its religious and political concerns. Male servants, born in Jewish families or purchased from the heathen, when they had submitted to the bloody rite, were subject to all the laws, and entitled to most of the privileges of the free-born. *Faith* in a Saviour to come was not required, either in the candidate, administrator, or parent; for the child of the most wicked infidel Jew had as much right to circumcision as those of the pious David or incorruptible Daniel. No

provision was made for females — they were unknown as legal components of the congregation: they might be present, but had no lot in the privileges of membership. Neither faith, repentance, nor a godly life, is necessary to be admitted into the Jewish congregation.

The great majority of the nation rejected Christ and his doctrines. "We are Moses' disciples," replied the Pharisees, revilingly, to the young man whose eyes had been opened by the Saviour, and they ejected him from their connection. On every occasion they made war against the new dispensation, calling Christ a deceiver, a colluder with Beelzebub, persecuting and imprisoning his disciples. Could they belong to the Christian dispensation — understand its economy, and imbibe its spirit? Saul of Tarsus was circumcised the eighth day — was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and profited in the Jews' religion; but when introduced into the new reign, "what things were gain to him, those he counted loss for Christ." The knowledge of the Redeemer in regeneration, he regards as more important and infinitely higher than all the advantages derived from circumcision or enjoyed in the Jewish Church. But if the dispensations are the same, then Paul was ungrateful for past privileges, and acted wrongfully in depreciating the old and exalting the new. Unless Paul was deceived, there was a *striking difference* between his condition in the Jewish congregation and New Testament dispensation: in the *former*, he was a *carnal man*, swelled with his own blamelessness; in the *latter*, he was a child of grace, renewed in the spirit of his mind.

Place along side the *materials of a Christian Church.* They are believers in Christ Jesus, whether male or female—children of God by faith. Look at some of the early churches: "Then they that *gladly received* his word were baptized"—"all that *believed* were together." Acts ii. These were members of the church in Jerusalem. When they *believed* Phillip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both *men and women.* Acts viii. These were members of the church at Samaria. And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house, and many of the Corinthians, hearing, *believed* and were baptized. Acts xviii. Cordial faith in the Saviour, with hearty repentance for sin, were the chief pre-requisites for membership. When the plan of salvation, as disclosed by evangelical preachers, was heard and believed, no inquiry was suggested whether they belonged to Abraham's posterity: this was not mentioned. Are the two alike?

SECTION III. The two organizations differ in their *ministry and services.* The priesthood under the old dispensation was confined to the family of Aaron—menial services were committed to that of Levi. The former were to wait on the priest's office, and the stranger (*i. e.* a person from any other family) should be put to death. Num. iii. 10. The penalty was executed in the sudden destruction of Korah and his associates, and the incurable leprosy of Uzziah, who had presumed to invade the priestly office. They must be free from bodily defects—kill the

sacrifices — dress the lamps, and perform such other services as the place of worship required. It is not known that they performed any mental labor—neither that they preached or expounded the law. Their services were corporeal. The prophets warned and denounced woes on the guilty, and urged to sackcloth, and fasting, and reformation.

Contrast those of the *New Testament Ministry.* They are men of different families, nations, occupations, and grades of talent. Some, inducted into office by the Head of the Church, were physicians, tent-makers, fishermen; but their sons have no title to office because their fathers were honored with the high distinction of being ministers of the everlasting gospel. How many now in the sacred office, successful in winning souls to Christ, must be dismissed if ministers of the present day correspond to the Jewish priesthood? How many are there, whose ministry God blesses with his approbation, with broken limbs, lame, blind, dwarfish, and otherwise defective, must stand aside, if qualifications under the old dispensation were demanded? The advocates of the theory which we censure, educate their own sons as preachers, without any knowledge of salvation and gospel requisitions —men unable to preach an evangelical discourse; but the curse of God, and the irreligion of the people, attest the iniquity of the system.

This is the case in all countries where the analogy between the two dispensations is supposed to exist, and is carried out by the law of the land. You may introduce the unconverted sons of ministers or others into the sacred of-

fice, but their labors generally will prove a blight instead of a blessing. They cannot preach to edification, and will seldom be listened to by the pious, unless where Church and State are linked together, and the people are compelled to hear and pay those whom they despise. But if the dispensations are the same, such are the only authorized expounders of God's Word — the only legal administrators of the ordinances of religion.

What is the condition of the ministry in the Church of England, probably the purest of any National Church? Is it slander to say they are wine-bibbers, sportsmen, gamblers, living in pleasure and splendor, neither men of prayer nor piety? They enter the ministry merely as a lucrative and genteel profession. It is freely admitted there are many honorable exceptions. What is their condition in papal, continental Europe, Mexico, and South America? The priests live in promiscuous and undisguised concubinage, as testified by Thompson, Stephens, and others. Yet, these are the legitimate results of the system. Are pious Pedo-baptists aware that these are the tendencies which their sentiments sanction? Talk to these ministers of *regeneration*, and they understand *baptism*—of the Holy Spirit in its operations on the heart of the pious, and it is *enthusiasm*.

Ministers of the *New Dispensation* preach the gospel — repentance towards God and faith in his Son — the necessity of regeneration by the Spirit of God — justification by faith — a blameless life — the resurrection of the righteous to a blessed immortality, and of the wicked to eter-

nal woe. Frequently they deliver their messages with an earnestness and power that none can gainsay or resist. They are men whose hearts have been changed — who are imbued largely with the spirit of their Master, and who, from experience, proclaim the terrors of the Lord, and necessity of the new birth: they have felt these terrors and undergone this essential change. They preach from the heart, and hence reach the hearts and trouble the consciences of their impenitent and disobedient hearers. They often hear the cry of distress, which broke forth from the multitude on the day of Pentecost — "What must we do?" The hand of the preacher, in his discriminating discourses, searches the slumbering conscience, and awakens agonies which cannot be described. But if the churches are *identical*, the sons only of ministers, as were those of Aaron, can be inducted into the sacred office:—they are to be our spiritual guides, though strangers to piety, and enemies to the glorious gospel of Christ.

SECTION IV. Numerous officers, rites, and ceremonies obtained under the old economy. Circumcision was the distinguishing rite, but the passover, feasts, and various offerings were prescribed by the ritual law. The heads of families were enjoined to have their male children and servants circumcised on the eighth day, but faith neither in the parent nor subject was necessary. Any person could officiate in the bloody ceremony.

Under the New Testament organization there are but two offices and two ordinances designed to be perpetual; Bishops or Elders and Deacons,

and Baptism and the Eucharist.* Most of the epistles are addressed to the churches: "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints." Rom. i. 7. "Unto the Church of God at Corinth—the sanctified in Christ Jesus—called to be saints." 1 Cor. i. 2. "To the saints which are at Ephesus." Eph. i. 1. "To all the saints in Christ Jesus at Phillippi, with the Bishops and Deacons." Phil. i. 1. Bishops and Elders are the only permanent officers named by Paul to Timothy and Titus; see 1 Tim. iii. 1, 12; v. 1, 17, 19. Titus i. 5, elders — 7, bishop, used interchangably: 1 Peter v. 1, elders; 2, "taking the oversight," (*episcopountes*,) exercising the office of bishop; Acts xx. 17, called the elders of the Church; 28, overseers, (*episcopous*,) bishops. In 17th verse the persons are called elders, (*presbuterous*) — in the 28th, (*episcopous*,) bishops. "Every Christian Church," says Mosheim, in his History of 1st Century, "consisted

---

* The Malabar Christians found by Dr. Buchanan, in 1——, are reported to be of Apostolic origin, and carry, to this day, marks of Apostolic simplicity, exceeding, both in practice and doctrine, the purity of any Christian Church since the days of the Apostles. "Such are the *heresies* of this church," said their Portuguese accusers, "that their clergy married wives—that they owned but two sacraments, *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper;* that they denied transubstantiation; that they neither invoked saints nor believed in purgatory, and that they had no other orders or names of dignity in the church than *bishop or deacon.*" Such was found to be their state in 1599. [Dr. Buchanan's Memoirs.] This same year, 1599, the Catholics burned their ancient libraries and archives at Angamalee. It is quite probable these people were regarded as *heretics;* their doctrines and practices resemble very much those of the Catharia, Novatian, and Waldensian *heresies* of the earlier ages — the New Testament doctrine. Who has corrupted them?

of the people, their leaders, bishops, and deacons."

The ordinances. "The rites instituted by Christ himself were *only two in number—baptism* and the *holy supper.*"* These were administered by those who had already received and partaken of them; not to males only of eight days old, as under the old economy, but to persons already penitent, and as the "answer of a good conscience." John introduced the ordinance of baptism, doubtless by the command of God — this was his authority, appearing in the character of Elias, to prepare the way for Messiah. Jesus himself was one of the early subjects, and urged John to administer the rite with "thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Matth. iii. 15. The Saviour instituted the eucharist, and distributed the bread and wine to his disciples. Matth. xxvi. 26, 29. The apostles also baptized and broke bread. In connection with the administration of baptism, we always find some river, pool, or fountain of water suitable for the purpose of *immersion.* The candidates were *believers*, who brought forth the fruits of repentance, and declared their faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ. Jesus was baptized in the river Jordan — John baptized also at Enon, because there was *much water there*, and the Eunuch received the initiating ordinance in some of the tributaries of the Sorek or Besor, which are crossed between Jerusalem and Ethiopia. (See Matth. iii. 15, 16—John iii. 23—Acts viii. 26, 39.) What could have en-

* Mosheim, p. 104.

gendered the question of the Eunuch in the 36th verse, "see, here is water," unless Philip, in preaching Christ to him, had urged also the duty of believers to be baptized?

SECTION V. The Jewish Theocracy was a *politico-religious* concern, embracing civil, political, and ecclesiastical matters, and designed for national purposes; whereas the new dispensation is *spiritual*, comprising only believers, persons born again. "My Kingdom," says the Saviour, "is not of this world." "It was evident that his kingdom was not of a secular nature, but related *wholly* to *spiritual* and heavenly things, and would be supported entirely by spiritual sanctions and authority." (Scott in loco.) "Splendid temples, costly vestments, multiplied sacrifices and external ceremonies, have nothing in them suited to his nature, and could only be appointed for a time to be *figures* of good things to come." (Scott on John iv. 23, 24.)—"Must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Not a temporal and political institution, and therefore has not—like the Mosaic, which stood in meats and drinks, and divers washings and *carnal ordinances*"—showy ceremonies to attract and dazzle the multitude—Heb. ix. 10. The subjects of Christ's Kingdom "were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" "not by natural descent from the blood of Abraham, or by their own *natural* choice as fallen creatures." (Scott.) Persons are not made members of Christ's kingdom by parentage, as were the descendants of the patriarch by natural birth, but by the transforming power of the Holy Spirit. But the

Jewish community was not so — the great majority were carnal men: the influence of the Spirit was not recognized as necessary to fit any one to enter the Old Testament congregation — they were members by birth and relation to Abraham. Observance of forms and attendance on worship, did not imply that they were friends of God and changed in heart; but membership in a gospel church pre-supposes that the persons are children of God by faith, though unworthy ones may creep into the consecrated fold. "There is no *religious* institution in the Old Testament, which is not also *political*. The idea of a church, distinct from the civil state, is not in the Old Testament. The Old Testament, then, is a *political* book, as really so, though not as exclusively, as the Federalist, or Hallam's Constitutional History. Is the New Testament, in this respect, like the Old? The *church* had nothing to do with the social or political relations of its members." (Rev. Dr. Bacon, of New Haven.)

Nicodemus was a ruler among the Jews, a Pharisaical teacher in the congregation, but was utterly astounded when Christ disclosed the doctrine of regeneration — one of the alphabetical lessons in the new dispensation. "How can these things be?" (John iii. 1, 12) inquired the astonished ruler. But if the Christian dispensation be but a *continuation* of the Jewish, would not a *ruler* in the *old* have understood one of the radical principles of the *new*? The new birth, disclosed in this chapter, was not essential to enter the old economy, but absolutely necessary for admission into the new: it is a

distinctive mark in the new — a *sine qua non*, without which there is no being in Christ's Kingdom. This conversation shows most clearly, not only the distinction between the organizations, but also that we should never confound the phrase "Kingdom of God or Heaven" with the visible church, as represented in the New Testament: they do not mean one and the same thing. "Except a man be born again, he cannot *see* the Kingdom of God;" but who cannot see a *visible church* when assembled? If it should be replied, the word "*see*" means to *perceive*, to *understand* — very well; but the 5th verse affirms that an unregenerated man cannot *enter into* the Kingdom of God; but cannot such a man *enter* the *visible church?* They do enter churches of all denominations, though contrary to the rule of admission. The primitive churches allowed none knowingly to enter but "believers," persons "begotten of God" — nor does a church formed after the New Testament model admit any but such now. The Old Testament economy did not reject any for want of the new birth; the Christian economy recognizes only such as members. Most Pedo-baptists in this country freely admit there is no real religion without regeneration, yet plead admission for their unregenerated children into the church, in which the Bible acknowledges only new creatures in Christ Jesus. The ignorance of Nicodemus on this subject, so vital to salvation, it would seem, should convince every inquirer after truth how *radically distinct* are the two dispensations. Yet with all these differences and dissimilarities between the two, many writers

attempt to prove them *identical*. Books and pamphlets, sufficient to make a large library, have been published and circulated with great assiduity, to inculcate the position that both are the same. In the subject under consideration, we do not look for the *identity* that exists in a child grown up to manhood; he is *identically* the same person that lived some twenty or thirty years ago, though he is larger, and great changes have taken place; but the same nature, form, feelings, and traits of character remain. But in the two dispensations before us, if *identical*, we do expect to find subjects of similar affections, natures, desires, qualifications, and spirit — similar laws to be obeyed and duties performed with an obedient mind. We do look for the *fundamental principles* in substance to be so much alike, that a member in the Hebrew congregation could go, *unchanged*, into the church of Christ, and *vice versa* — no essential change being necessary.

But it has been shown that this is not the case in the matter at issue. Take Nicodemus and Paul as instances. The one was utterly astounded at the doctrine of regeneration, a fundamental principle in the Christian religion. Paul was arrested by the Saviour in his career of persecuting the saints, and "called, by his grace," (Gal. i. 15) to the ministry of the gospel. He says, he "obtained mercy because he did it ignorantly in unbelief." "We see," says McKnight, "how much guilt a man, who is not at pains to inform himself, may through ignorance contract, without going contrary to his conscience." A radical change was effected in

him, or he would not have abandoned the Jews' religion, in which he "profited above" his cotemporaries; for as touching the law — the requisitions of the old dispensation — he was "blameless;" but the gospel kingdom into which he is now brought, has *higher* requisitions — a changed nature and new affections. Now "*he prays*," (Acts ix. 2,) and soon preaches repentance at Damascus and at Jerusalem; of both of which exercises, it is clear, he was ignorant prior to the change wrought in him by the Spirit. These cases show the *distinctness* in the two organizations so clearly, that no eye can but perceive it.

Identity may be applied to the Romish Church since the tenth century: no *radical* change has been made, though it has had *two or three visible heads* at the same time, and though it has altered its laws and regulations. The Episcopal, through Henry VIII — the Presbyterian, through John Calvin — the Lutheran, through Martin Luther — and most other Pedo-baptist sects, derive their existence from Rome. But they are not *identical* — they differ widely in some things. A tree sends forth shoots, but these are not the identical stock — they are descended from it, but are not the tree itself. The descendants of a pious father fail frequently to imbibe his spirit and possess his gracious qualifications, so that you aver, *he lives in his sons* — his mantle has fallen upon them. Would evangelical Pedo-baptists be pleased to have us regard them as *identical* with the Romish Church from which they are descended? Yet they cannot deny their origin — the records are too plain, and too easy of access.

They would reject the idea of *identity* with disdain, and affirm we had libeled and defamed them. They would bring in as proof against our allegation, that they *differ essentially* in the fundamentals of faith, church polity, and ordinances: so we maintain in regard to the subject in hand. The Romanists, in common with Protestants, are *identical* in some fundamentals, such as the Trinity, the substance of the Apostles' creed; but you cannot find so many points of resemblance between the Jewish congregation and the Christian Church, as established under Apostolic influence, as between Romanists and most Protestant Pedo-baptists. That portion which adheres to prelacy, different grades in the clergy, regard a *visible head* or primate necessary: the Presbyterians concentrate the power of government in a *Session* and higher judicatories, and others differ slightly; yet these sects do not recognize one another as the same body, or *identical* — they are *distinct* denominations, and so wish to be regarded. Yet their differences are *small*, in comparison with those existing in the case under consideration. Some of them allow they are all different branches of the same church: others maintain that *they alone* are the *true church*, and the rest are *unauthorized intruders* in sacred things, and have no right to administer the ordinances or expound the Word of God.

It is questionable whether the two General Assemblies of Presbyterians in the United States, though separated only about a dozen years, would like to be considered *identical*, while they argue that identity exists between

the Hebrew Theocracy and the visible kingdom of Christ on earth: yet in how much do they differ? It was proposed, a few years past, as they assembled in the same city, to celebrate the Lord's Supper together; but the resolution was not carried — was not accepted!

SECTION VI. Let us look at the *two dispensations* in opposite columns:—

The covenant of circumcision was made nineteen hundred years before Christ.—Gen. xvii.

"This is my covenant — every man child among you shall be circumcised — it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money: my covenant shall be in your flesh."

That at Sinai, supposed to be a renewal of the other, was made 1500 years before Christ. Exodus xix. 5, 6.

"If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people."

Mr. Scott observes that this latter was "the *national* covenant, a *type* of the covenant made with believers in Christ Jesus."

But children were in the Abrahamic covenant, and no law can be shown to reject them from the gospel covenant.

The *new* covenant was promised 590 years before Christ: "I will make a *new covenant* with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. I will put my law in their inward parts, and will write it in their hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my people." Jer. xxxi. 31, 33. Paul quotes this passage in Hebrews viii. 6, 10, and shows it belongs to gospel times, having a new priesthood, even Jesus Christ.

The promise of the outpouring of the Spirit is made 720 years before Christ, in Joel ii. 28–9, and is interpreted by Peter (Acts ii. 17, 18) to take place in gospel times. "I will pour out my Spirit upon *all flesh*," &c.

In regard to the new covenant named in Jeremiah, Mr. Scott says: "This promise of a new covenant, as Paul hath shown in Hebrews viii., implied the abrogation of the Mosaic Law, and introduction of another and *more spiritual dispensation*."

True—the Jews derived certain privileges by natural descent: but gospel blessings do not come in this way. "If ye be *Christ's*, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. Ye are all the children of God *by faith*." Gal. iii. 29, 26.

In Matth. iii. 7, 9, John rejects Pharisees and Saducees from the initiating ordinance of the new dispensation, unless they exhibit fruits of repentance. This decision excludes all the impenitent

Jews and Gentiles, adults and children.

But they are *natural* branches of Abraham — the tree of righteousness: if the father is accepted, so are the children. Rom. xi. 24. They are in the tree as branches are, and if the tree is saved, so are the branches.

"Abraham *believed* God, and it it was accounted unto him for righteousness." "They which are of *faith*, the same are the children of Abraham." Gal. iii. 6, 7. None are accepted unless through *faith*. Abraham could not communicate *faith* by descent. But, in order that your inference and Paul's reasoning accord, you must show that the children *exercise faith*, in order to be accepted as was Abraham. The branches were broken off—20th verse — "*because of unbelief;*" hence, children that do not believe can derive no benefit from their relation: if branches were "broken off because of *unbelief*," it is clear none can be introduced without belief, nor retain their standing without it; but it is not claimed that children possess this grace.

Abraham believed God, and was circumcised, and commanded to circumcise his household: so Christians are to bring their children into the covenant by baptism; and this is the seal, as circumcision was under the Old Economy.

Abraham believed God some thirteen years prior to his circumcision, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. From Rom. iv. 1–9, it is clear that his faith and the forgiveness he received of God, constituted his acceptance, not his circumcision. But a similar blessing comes upon all that are forgiven and exercise faith, whether circumcised or not — to all "who walk in the steps of *that faith* of our father Abraham." Rom. iv. 12.

For the inference about children's being baptized, there is neither Scripture nor logic. Baptism is not a *seal*, "but the answer of a good conscience." 1 Peter iii. 21.

But did not Paul assure the Galatians that the covenant of circumcision, which had been confirmed in Christ, the law, 430 years thereafter, could not disannul? Hence, this covenant is sure as the covenant of grace to the posterity of all believers.

The law was given at Sinai 407 years after the covenant of circumcision. But the covenant alluded to in Gal. iii. 8, 17, is recorded in Genesis xii. 3, as McKnight avers: this was exactly 430 years before the promulgation of the law at Sinai, and 23 prior to the establishment of circumcision. "In thee shall all the

families of the earth be blessed." Gen. xii. 3. The best chronologists agree with McKnight, that the *promise*, rather than the *covenant*, alluded to in Galatians iii., is that in Genesis xii., and hence has no allusion to the covenant of circumcision. This is Bloomfield's opinion.

How different are the two! One commands, "Circumcise your foreskin;" and "if ye obey my voice, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure:" the other promises to put God's law "in the inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and to pour out the Spirit upon *all flesh*," Gentiles as well as Jews, as came to pass on the day of Pentecost. It is not the covenant made with Abraham and his posterity, for that embraced only one nation: this respects *all flesh*, all nations. In the covenant of circumcision, nor in that at Sinai is there any promise of the Spirit's influences. The persons addressed by Peter are supposed by some writers to be both Jews and Gentiles, representing some dozen nations, Parthians, Egyptians, and others. Most authors, however, maintain that Jews only were present. (1) It is supposed by Pedo-baptists to refer to the covenant of circumcision, because the word "children" is named in the 39th verse. But this word (*techna*) means posterity. In 2d Sam. xix. 21, Mephibosheth is called the son of Saul, though actually his grand-son. (See Brown's Bible Dictionary.) The covenant at Sinai is supposed to be a renewal of that made with Abraham; but neither had any real sacrifice for sin — the promises were all of a temporal

(1) See "Notes and Illustrations."

kind. "Yet that a second covenant or dispensation was to be introduced, is evident from God's own words, (Jer. xxxi. 31–4,) in which is promised a new covenant; not by *dark shadows*, as in the old covenant, but in the clearest manner. Thus it appears that the prophet Jeremiah, in the most express terms, hath borne testimony to the superior excellence of the *new covenant* or dispensation, of which Christ is the Minister, Mediator, or High Priest."—(McKnight on Heb. viii.) In one dispensation we have parents, some good and pious men, others infidel in sentiment and immoral in life, with their unbelieving offspring of eight days old: in the other, we find *believers*, and *believers* only. "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized: and *believers* were the more added unto the Lord, multitudes of both men and women." "Voluntarily they gave their own selves unto the Lord," not by sponsors, but as persons capable of determining and acting for themselves. Acts ii. 5; 2 Cor. viii. 5. Philip would not baptize the Eunuch, till he was assured of his faith. None but believers knowingly were admitted into the primitive churches.

SECTION VII. It is maintained that, as the Apostles were not directed to organize a *new church*, it is proof that none was necessary—the old one in existence formed at Sinai, was altogether sufficient.

God had disclosed to Daniel, some 900 years after the giving of the law at Sinai, that He would *set up* a *new kingdom* to be "possessed by the saints," and to be "everlasting." Both John

the Baptist and Christ announced, "The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand:"—Matth. iii. 2; iv. 17, the constituents, spiritual worshipers—"For the Father seeketh *such* to worship him."—John iv. 23; "A spiritual house to offer up spiritual sacrifices."—1 Peter ii. 5. That this is the kingdom, the Gospel Kingdom, foretold to Daniel, is most evident. A nation had been selected, of which Abraham was the head, to keep up the worship of God, so that there might be a visible people to acknowledge his authority and obey his commands; but nothing purely *spiritual* in the nature of an organization, had been erected. The disciples and Apostles were constituents of this new kingdom and of the Gospel Church. The very nature of the Christian religion, says Storr, drew the first Christians into union and fellowship among themselves.—John xiii. 34: Eph. iv. 3-6, 16; Col. iii. 16. They had identity of views, feelings and hopes, trials, interests, joys — they were traveling the same road to Heaven; and were tending to the same immortal blessings. Such persons would naturally associate: "They were all with one *accord in one place*" on the day of Pentecost, and "all that *believed* were together, and had all things common."—Acts ii. 1–44.

We do not read of any ceremonies being performed at the organization of any of the Apostolic churches:—believers, regenerate persons, disciples of Jesus Christ, would naturally coalesce and associate much together, to praise and worship their Saviour. One of their first acts was to choose Matthias, to supply the place vacated by the treachery of Judas.—Acts i. 26.

After the imprisonment of the Apostles, and their release, "they went to their *own company;*" the prayer-meeting followed, which shook the place, and "all were of *one heart and one soul.*" Acts iv. 23, 32. Some had shaken off the yoke of Judaism—others had emerged from the darkness of heathenism — they were all one. As a people which have broken the chains of despotism, if they have sufficient knowledge and virtue, will naturally coalesce in a Republic — so those which have become "new creatures in Christ Jesus," will unite in church relations and duties. Long before independence was declared, our people possessed all the elements of freedom, capable of self-government: their feelings and spirit had been changed from monarchical to republican views. The particular *form* was given to the government in 1787–9, and by subsequent acts of Congress: so *form* and shape were given to the Church by the inspired directions of the Apostles, and the disciples, under the tuition of the Spirit, "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered to them."—Rom. vi. 17.

If the objection above stated against a new dispensation be valid, because the Apostles were not instructed in the Old Testament to organize a new Church, then a valid objection will rest against the officers in it; for while there were priests in the old economy, no authority was given in it to appoint any other kind in the new: hence, Bishops and Deacons are unauthorized intruders in the new dispensation. Will Puritans —will Protestants generally — admit the force of this cavil, and so come back to Jewish and

Popish times? The inspired men who completed the sacred canon of Scripture, were competent to set in order all things which the Master had left to their prudence and knowledge.

If it should be said there was no Church in the time of John the Baptist—for Christ had declared he would build upon Peter, and hence the dispensation of the Harbinger was distinct from that under the Apostles—the argument above furnishes a sufficient refutation. The discourses of John—"repent—confessing their sins—baptism—remission of sins;" (Matthew iii. and Mark i.), resemble very much the first sermon after the resurrection: "repent, and be baptized—remission of sins."—Acts. ii. 38. The doctrines preached both by John and the Apostles were the same. Belief generally controls practice: hence, their practice in the management of church polity, so far as this had been developed, was the same. It is not urged that in John's time there was any regular ecclesiastical organization; but the materials, the instructions, practices, feelings and views of those taught [*discipled*—Matth. xxviii. 19, 20] by the Harbinger, were identical with those prescribed by the Apostles.

But all Protestants, except the advocates of Prelacy, repudiate the dogma, that in the new dispens tion there is any authority for priests, or different orders of the ministry: yet, if the two organizations are the same, the rejection of the priesthoad virtually nullifies the supposed identity, and destroys the theory. Catholics and Church-men are more consistent.

The objection in regard to *a new church* implies

that nothing could be done by *inspired* men unless the direction had been previously *published*, and handed down to this critical age: as if the men of the nineteenth century were competent to sit in judgment on the course the Apostles should pursue. How do these critics know they had not been directed to *set up a new church*, as well as constitute *deacons* and abolish circumcision? By the time Old Testament directions are produced for ordaining deacons and abolishing circumcision in regard to Gentile believers, it will be time enough to present those for the organization of a new church. Was there any direction for the formation of churches at Samaria, Corinth, and at other places? Were not the founders of these to blame for their missionary labors? The disciples of Christ did not find, in the Hebrew congregations, congenial spirits, persons of the same feelings and sympathies with themselves: hence, they associated together as a peculiar people, acknowledging "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," active in building a spiritual edifice, which God himself had promised to grace with His royal presence.

But is there not a strong intimation of God's design to erect a *new church*, as announced by Malachi, only some 400 years before the advent? "I will send my messenger, (John the Baptist,) and he shall prepare the way before me."—Mal. iii. 1. Did he not prepare the way before Messiah, by proclaiming repentance, confession of sin, and baptism? If he had set about reforming the Jewish congregations, telling the priests that this and that abuse must be reformed, and not gone into the country, proclaiming a doctrine

that cut off all hopes of salvation by relation to Abraham, the case would stand differently. The design of his preaching was to build up an institution very different from the Jewish Church. Mr. Scott, on Isaiah xl. 3–5, observes—"A spiritual preparation of a similar nature," (to the literal clearing of roads for kings,) "was to be made for the coming of Christ, and the *setting up* of his kingdom. And the first Jewish converts to Christianity, seemed to have *been prepared* by John's ministry for that of Christ and his Apostles." On Matth. iii. 2, he says—"The kingdom of heaven signifies the gospel dispensation, which is so called because the God of heaven *then began to set up* that kingdom. Into this kingdom, sinners *enter by faith* in Christ." "This very demand of repentance," says Dr. Doddridge, "showed it was a *spiritual kingdom*, and that no wicked man could be a genuine member of it. Without repentance, the people could not understand the nature of the kingdom of heaven."

SECTION VIII. Some Pedo-baptists suppose that Proselytes formed a part of the Jewish congregation, and that the New Testament ordinance was derived from the practice of baptizing such as came over from heathenism to the Temple worship. The Scriptures, however, furnish no proof for this supposition—it is mere assumption. If the Eunuch were a proselyte, and had been baptized to make him so, it seems clear, from its having been administered by Philip, that the dispensations are not the same, else the rite submitted to under the *one*, would have been valid under *the other*, and answered the demands

of the law. Why was it repeated? It was not done by force, as some practice infant sprinkling, for the candidate requested it; and if the suggestion had come from the administrator, while the Eunuch did not discover the propriety of it, he could have informed him that he had once received the ordinance, and as the new was but a continuation of the old dispensation, to whose authority he had submitted, every requisition of law was answered. If it should be said, the first was administered in *unbelief*, then you put into our hands an unanswerable argument to overturn the theory of baptizing infants, which have no faith, and of repeating the administration when not rightly performed.

Rev. Dr. Benson, a Pedo-baptist, has examined this subject with great care. His observations, condensed, are: "That there was no such practice before the advent of the Saviour, and none now among the Jews—that some centuries ago, those that came over from heathenism did *wash themselves*, but were not washed by others; though I must own," he says, "I cannot see how infants could wash themselves." There is no warrant in the Bible for Proselyte baptism, nor any mention of it in the Apochrypha, Josephus, or Philo. It is a mere tradition. Dr. Lardner calls it "*a mere fiction of the Rabbins.*"

Any one acquainted with the Scriptures, will read the sentiments of Drs Spring and Worcester with surprise and wonder. If the missionaries, Messrs. Judson, Newell, Nott, Rice, and Hall, were descendants of Abraham, the instructions in Dr. Spring's discourse would not seem so inconsistent with Bible teachings. But

beside, it has been shown that there were no "*seals*" in the covenant with Abraham, as intimated. Circumcision was a mark in the flesh, and a sign or seal of Abraham's faith, which had been in operation *over thirteen years* before he was circumcised. But it was no *seal* to his posterity — only a national distinction, through which the truth of the fulfillment of prophecy to Jacob might be verified, that Shiloh's lineage should be traced to the father of the faithful.

But by "*seals*" Dr. S. means baptism and the eucharist, assuming that they have come in lieu of circumcision and the paschal supper. But under the old dispensation there was but one "seal" named, and that to Abraham only, in attestation of the righteousness of his faith. But it is maintained there are "*seals*" under the new. Well hath the wise man said, "The legs of the *lame* are not equal"—Prov. xxvi. 7: conjectural theories need crutches, and still their gait indicates weakness. How much is assumed, which the Bible does not authorize, before the theory can be made even plausible! That is, that the two dispensations are one and the same, and that baptism has come in the place of circumcision, for neither of which is there any scriptural proof. Hundreds of men, distinguished for their Biblical knowledge and varied learning, have racked their invention, and ransacked their libraries, furnishing the world with ponderous volumes in the shape of arguments; but the proof is not yet made out — it is theory and assumption to this day — what the logicians call *petitio principii*. The sacred writers, in baptism, recognize no beneficial spiritual rela-

tion between parents and children: the former are not required to have it administered, nor the latter to submit to the ordinance. No intimation is given in the New Testament that God would fulfill to professing parents, who have their children baptized, promises made to the Patriarch. There might be some difficulty in applying "*the seals*" to adult "domestics" in India; for though fond of bathing in water, they might object to its being thrown into the face.

A *seal* has nothing to do with the formation or stipulations of a covenant or instrument of writing — it only attests the certainty and genuineness of the transaction, as evidence of its truth and certainty. The *seal* had no bearing on the *spiritual interests* of Abraham himself, much less on his posterity. It was a confirmation of God's approbation of faith, which had been in existence some thirteen years; but it did not secure the operation — it could not produce or originate what was already in being. The seal was affixed, as to instruments in our day, long after the approbation of God had been given to Abraham in consideration of his confidence and obedience. But it is confirmed to him only as the friend of God. The mark secured temporal and political blessings to his natural descendants, as it distinguished them from all other nations. The reading is, "Father of all them that *be'ieve*, though they be not circumcised:" but it would answer the purpose of our opponents, and afford some analogy for their theory with New Testament teachings, if it read on this wise: "And the *spiritual* father of all his circumcised posterity, securing their salvation; also that of all

baptized parents, their children and domestics." But it does not so read.

A seal is nowhere mentioned in the New Testament in connection with the salvation of any person except *believers*. In 2 Cor. i. 22, Eph. i. 13, we find sealing, but it regards "*saints*" "*anointed*" of God — the "*faithful* in Christ Jesus"—"after that ye *believed*, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." Hence, those who talk about the seal of the covenant to *unbelievers*, unconscious babes, understand "neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." Can it be shown that God has given any intimation that he would save a child or adult, solely on the faith of another? Abraham, the man of God and faith, the father of the faithful, it seems, could not save his *relatives* from the destruction that came upon Sodom: nor was even that part of the covenant which was of a *temporal import*, secured to Ishmael, one of the earliest subjects of circumcision — he was not allowed to settle in the land of Canaan, but was driven into Arabia. Few of the posterity of the Patriarch, in comparison with the millions of the nation, were the children of God; *his faith*, so far as the Scriptures inform us, was not sufficiently efficacious to save any of his numerous progeny. Neither Lois nor Eunice, the maternal ancestors of Timothy, communicated faith to him: he was *called* of God, as other sinners are, "according to his own purpose and grace, given in Christ Jesus before the world began." Parental instruction was probably sanctified to his conversion, but this was prior to his receiving the rite of circumcision. To

instruct our children in the Scriptures is the duty of every parent.

A greater theological absurdity was never propagated, than that piety in a parent secures its exercise in children. It should be ranked with the monstrous errors of transubstantiation and indulgences. *Seals:* Salmacius says infant baptism originated in the dogma that it produced regeneration, and infant membership began with it. But infants enjoy but *one seal*, for they do not come to the supper. Why are they prohibited? and why called members, yet disfranchised? why are they thus tantalized? Protestants charge Romish priests with administering the bread to laymen, but keep all the *wine for themselves:* are they less exposed to inconsistency and insincerity than Romanists?

But Dr. Worcester's sentiments are the more astounding, because they exhibit so much ignorance of the Bible. He was the early Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and for a quarter of a century regarded as the champion of the "standing order" in polemic divinity, and in theological acumen. Yet he affirms "Christ was baptized to induct him into his priestly office!" But if the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had foreseen what perversion of Scripture would be attempted in a corrupt age, he could not have guarded it more effectually, nor rebuked the perverters with more plainnesss. "For it is evident our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood."—Heb. vii. 14. All Jewish priests must be descended from Aaron; hence, Jesus Christ

could not, on earth, officiate in the priesthood. To assert, then, that he was baptized to induct him into his priestly office, is most manifestly to pervert the Scriptures. Will not every candid reader perceive, that to carry a point — to prop up a crumbling, unsound theory, was the object in view? This only could so effectually expose the ignorance or insincerity of a professed scholar and theologian. Scarcely would an ordinary Sabbath School scholar of our day make a blunder so egregious. Surely he must have been jaundiced by a most inveterate prejudice, or controlled by the impressions made upon his mind while in leading-strings.

SECTION IX. It is urged that infants were admitted into the Old Testament Church by a religious rite — the two churches are one and the same — infant membership has never been set aside — hence, continues with the new dispensation.

It is conceded they entered the old dispensation by *birth*, by relation to Abraham's family, and circumcision; but the *new* does not allow "blood, flesh, nor the will of man," to be qualifications for Christ's Kingdom: hence, the cases are not analagous. The door into the New Testament Church is, regeneration, new birth — "except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God."*—John i. 13; iii. 3.

But where is the law to *set aside* their membership? "The Senate shall be composed of *two Senators* from each State."—Constitution U.

---

* The Greek for *man* is *tis*, any person, any or some one, a human being.

S., Art. I., Sec. 3. Will any man in his senses affirm there is no inhibition against *more than two Senators?* No law says that any larger number is inadmissible; but does not the defining *how many* may be admitted from each State, amount to a prohibition of others? Hence the conditions of admission to a privilege, as certainly exclude all except those named in the conditions, as an express law could do it. "He that believeth and is baptized," are conditions as authoritative as the clause in our Constitution in regard to "two Senators." He who argues the right of others to enter, because no express law has "*set aside*" their claim, is, as Dr. Johnson says, not to be reasoned with. If the conditions of admission to a church of Jesus Christ do not imply faith, new birth, repentance, and an obedient spirit, then every and all kinds of persons, the insane, and infidel, and idiot, may claim church privileges, and exclude the real disciples of Christ.

We grant, say our opponents, that these conditions are prohibitions to adults, but not to children.

But will not a qualification required in an adult, be also required in a child, and, if not found, exclude him? The parent and child both entered the Hebrew Congregation by circumcision without faith; but the New Testament admits none except *believers*. A. B., a citizen of England, enjoys all the rights and immunities guaranteed by the laws of the land, and so will his sons, when arrived at age: but if he remove to this country, his own naturalization does not naturalize his sons; they become citizens by

residence in the country, if they landed here in infancy. Citizenship in our government, is not, like estates in some countries, a matter that can be entailed and retained and enjoyed in another. Citizens of England do not become citizens of Spain merely on landing in that kingdom, though both are Monarchical Governments. Though there be no law in the land whence they have removed to *set aside* their citizenship, yet the conditions in the laws of the country where they settle, as completely nullify all former rights, as if they were enactments of their native land. Our country requires the oath of naturalization; it does not recognize any rights touching citizenship acquired in any other country. So in the subject before us: the father must "bring forth fruits for repentance" prior to admission into a church of Jesus Christ—the son must do the same. These requisitions are peremptory, because the Head of the Church has made them so. If some children of foreigners may elude the keen-sightedness of officers, the estates of all such at death will fall to the government. But no one may hope to escape the All-seeing Eye, and suppose he will be safe, because he has crept into the church without suitable qualifications — without the wedding garment. The conditions for membership in the Christian Church have all the force which a special enactment in the Jewish theocracy could have had, *setting aside* the claims of unsuitable candidates. They quash all rights to New Testament privileges as effectually as if Moses had been inspired to announce, "When Shiloh shall have appeared to set up his kingdom, no requi-

sition short of faith in his atoning sacrifice will satisfy the demands of the gospel." The oath of naturalization will answer for only one person: a hundred *paternal* oaths would not constitute a grown son a citizen. So in the elective franchise: one man cannot vote *as a substitute* for another, if his desire were expressed in writing, or attested by a thousand witnesses. The right of suffrage is a *personal matter*, and regarded too high and holy to be entrusted to our nearest friend. Nor can one man take an oath for another: this is purely a personal matter, and can no more be transferred than *consciousness* or individual responsibility. And will you *cheapen* religion by representations that make it less important than a *common oath* before a petty magistrate? It is a profanation: yet this is the fashionable way of making disciples of Christ by the *promise* of a second person!

But is not discipleship, which has a bearing on both worlds — on the eternal interests of the soul — more momentous than civil or political rights or privileges? As proxy business will not pass in law, so it should never be attempted in religion, unless we regard it as a *mere farce*. So high and sacred do the American people regard citizenship, that the elective franchise can be exercised only by citizens in their own persons: the constitution and laws admit nothing like proxy in privileges so sacred. In this they follow the teachings and examples of the Bible; for in that directory, religion is represented as a purely personal affair. The enrolling children before they can speak, as disciples, through godfathers, is neither recognized, named, nor allu-

ded to, in the New Testament. This *farcical business* was invented in the dark ages, when apostolical piety had ceased, and the light of Bible truth had been extinguished. All such are intellectual vassals — the high privilege of professing Christ for themselves, is taken away in childhood by unscriptural officiousness. If they should ever become *real* disciples, they are precluded the pleasure of "the answer of a good conscience toward God, in obeying the truth." —1 Pet. iii. 21; i. 22. Jesus Christ saith, "Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow me." Paul affirms of Timothy that he had "*professed* a good profession before many witnesses." Such are the representations of all disciples named in the New Testament, which knows nothing about infants as members of the Church.

A man's becoming a Christian, a believer, a child of God, does not make his child so; if the father must possess gracious qualifications to enter the church, so must his child. Such qualifications were not demanded in the old economy, but they are in the new. This shows the radical distinction between the two, and sets aside the claims of all that do not exhibit repentance and faith.

But no law has *set aside* the membership of children. In the case supposed touching citizenship, it is not to be expected that we should find in the English laws any enactment, declaring that such a class of emigrants should be disfranchised or be ineligible to citizenship in any other country, because they had left their native land: the terms of admission must be stated by

that country where they propose to become citizens, which alone has jurisdiction in the premises. "I was a citizen of Great Britain; but the two governments are the same: no law has *set aside* my rights in that country: hence, I am now one of the United States!" But will the United States admit such logic? By no means; nor would any sane man, who desired to emigrate, if advised by the wisest statesman in that country, be cheated by such a sophism. If he becomes naturalized in this country according to law, his children are not naturalized by the father's oath: citizenship, like church membership, is a *personal matter*, and cannot be secured by proxy.

So it is in the two dispensations under consideration: the Old Testament may contain no law *setting aside* membership either of adults or infants. While they remain under the old, as do the Jews at the present day, they enjoy its privileges; but to enter a gospel church, certain qualifications must be possessed — repentance, faith, and the new birth. Who would expect to find, in the Abrahamic covenant, a hint even, that children must go out of that dispensation when Christ shall appear? Why? Because such a matter does not necessarily belong to that covenant. Jesus Christ has *set up* a new kingdom, as has been shown, and He, as King, has the right to prescribe such qualifications to enter it as seemeth good in his sight. God prescribed that parents and male children might enter the old covenant; but in setting up the *new*, of a more *spiritual* nature, established upon better promises, into which none but *believers* may

enter, has any one a ground of complaint, or right to blame the Author because He has not seen fit so to frame it as to suit the prejudices of the captious? We find *women* in the *new*, and their influence will be great in leading the young to Christ, and we rejoice in this provision; but we cannot admit the children unless we find the authority or example in the New Testament.

Neither the Old Testament nor the New, contains any law abolishing the three orders in the priesthood: the priesthood existed under the Mosaic dispensation, high priest, ordinary priests and Levites, and these *have never been set aside:* hence, as the two churches are the same, it follows there must be three orders of priests in the Christian Church. This lands us all on the Episcopal platform, for these three orders have *not been set aside.* This obliterates all claims of dissenters to be a New Testament church, for they lack the original ministry which God appointed in his ancient churches.

Presbyterians and others, however, parry the force of this plea of Episcopalians, by affirming that the New Testament, the sure guide for gospel churches, knows nothing about three orders of priests, but instead thereof, bishops and deacons are named as the only officers known and designed to be permanent. They do not think it necessary to look into the Old Testament or the New, to ascertain whether the priesthood has, in so many words, been abolished — they are satisfied that the offices and duties of bishops and deacons are minutely described, while the other is not recognized as having any connection with gospel churches.

"The Jewish and Christian Churches are the same:" the first was *national*, the second must also be *national*. This inference is logical and irresistable: for divine authority established the old, *national*, and has never set it aside; the new is but a continuation of the old, and hence is also *national*, embracing all of every age, class, color, and condition — they are all in the church, and should be subject to its authority, and only one denomination can be tolerated. Such was New England, in a degree, for more than a century, because she had shaped her ecclesiastical polity after the Jewish theocracy.

But this course of reasoning will land us in Popery as well as in Episcopacy — it will give a visible head to a national church, with power to destroy by the sword all non-conformists. Pedo-baptists must cease to inquire for our *divine rite*, in order to keep children out of the gospel church, or they must repudiate all that they possess of congregationalism and republican Christianity, and fall into the arms of the *true mother church*, or those of *her eldest daughter*.

In all countries, children are born subjects, and so in the Israelitish nation; they became a part of it at eight days old, *de facto*, citizens in all its ecclesiastical concerns: but no one becomes a citizen of Christ's Kingdom, except by new birth, and obedience to his laws.

The English and United States Governments differ materially; but if they were alike, the subjects of the former could not become so of the latter, without the possession of the qualifications which it should please to prescribe. One government would regard it as impertinent, if

another should presume to sit in judgment, and prescribe who might be admitted to citizenship in the first. Now, if it could be shown that the Jewish Congregation and Christian Church were alike in many of these features, still, as we have seen in human governments, the right to citizenship in one does not secure this right in another: so the right to membership in the old, avails naught in regard to the new. But they were essentially distinct: much more, then, qualifications for one will not satisfy the demands of the other.

It is presumed the following proposition, stated *syllogistically*, will set the matter in so clear a light, that no one can resist the conclusion:

The countries where residence is desired by foreigners, have the sole right to prescribe conditions of citizenship; the United States prescribes the oath of allegiance; hence, those only who take the oath can be citizens.

The *church* where membership is desired, has the sole right to prescribe the terms of admission; the Church of Jesus Christ prescribes faith, repentance, and baptism; those only who accept the terms, or give evidence of possessing the qualifications, can be admitted.

But Pedo-baptists suppose that we shall find the membership of children "*set aside*," if at all, in the old dispensation; whereas, that dispensation has nothing to do in the premises, for we have shown most clearly that the new dispensation only has jurisdiction in this matter.

The Pedo-baptist proposition, in substance, may be stated thus:

The country *from* which a person emigrates has the sole authority to disfranchise its own citizens, or confer the right of citizenship in any other; England does not disfranchise her citizens when they leave; hence, they are entitled to citizenship in any country where they choose to settle. Or, as it regards the Dispensations:

The Hebrew theocracy had the sole authority to exclude its members, and confer the right to enter any other dispensation; it received children as members, and has never excluded them from the covenant; hence, children have the right to enter the New Testament Church, which is but a continuation of the old.

The United States, and all sovereign States, deny the proposition, and reject it as an impertinent interference where they alone have jurisdiction: it is false, in fact, and can never be reduced to practice: it would bring into collision and bloody contests any government which should attempt it. So also in the church: it would work confusion, and destroy the purity of religion. What would be the condition of a Christian Church, if the Jews, (descendants of Abraham,) at this day, should demand membership solely on being able to trace their lineage from the Patriarch? Is there in Christendom a Pedo-baptist church, that has any claim to be *evangelical*, which would receive such an applicant? But their own theory requires the reception of just such persons; yet the evangelical among them, would reject the application with disdain, because it trenches upon rights fenced around by the holiest and highest sanctions.

Hence, they will not blame us for rejecting a theory which in practice they cannot approve.

Dr. Austin is very certain there has been no revocation of infant membership, for "none could revoke it but God." The opposers "have not been able to produce such a revocation." It is presumed, however, that no man will hereafter look for a "revocation" in the old Testament, but in its proper place, in the conditions of admission into the Gospel Church. The multitude of foreigners flocking to our shores may swell our population, as do children and other unconverted persons the numbers of some sects; but as the *naturalized* and *converted* only are real members of the nation and the Gospel Church, the show of a multitude benefits neither the one nor the other in fact; they are dangerous in times of collision with other governments; they will, like Judas, prove traitors to the cause of Christ, and be worse than useless branches, in the way of such as would produce valuable fruit.

This stereotyped sophism is frequently used against the Baptists: Infants of believers are found in the church before the coming of Christ —in Pedo-baptist Churches now—in the Saviour's arms—in Heaven: but never in the land of despair, nor in a Baptist Church: Baptists refuse to baptise those whom Christ has received; but if fit for Heaven they are fit for baptism.

This is an appeal to our *natural sympathies*, in order to decide a question of duty, in regard to Bible directions—*positive institutions*. Christ took up children in his arms, declaring "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven;" hence they are en-

titled to church membership — if entitled to the greater blessing, certainly to the less.

Among the "Friends," or Quakers, are many pious persons, who furnish the best evidence of a change of heart — who love God, and are rich in good works; but Pedo-baptists, though they regard them fit for heaven, will not admit them to communion in their churches, without baptism: hence, according to their own practice, persons may be fit for heaven, yet not for a Pedo-baptist Church! This shows that a portion of their own doctrine is not reduced to practice; it is a mere sophism and not an argument founded in truth.

There are other persons, too, from their unfortunate connections in this world, who cannot be admitted into a church of Jesus Christ, yet who give evidence they are on the way to heaven. Here is a divorced person, according to law, but not according to the Scriptures; God has lately changed his heart, and brought him to repentance, and he would unite with God's people: but his first wife is married again, and so is he; now, though regarded as a truly penitent man, his case is such as not to be remedied on earth, and if he can get to heaven we shall all rejoice; yet if he would put away his present wife, and return to the other, her husband might not accede to the proposition; so that though he may *repent*, he cannot *restore*. He is not a suitable person for membership in a Church of Christ; yet the evidence in favor of his piety is as clear as exhibited by any person. We regard children in the same light: they may be fitted for heaven by the influence of the Spirit, but are un-

able to furnish the church with such evidence as will satisfy it, hence cannot be baptized. We dare not admit them to the ordinances which require faith as a pre-requisite, as they are unable to give a reason of the hope that is within them. We trust, through infinite mercy and grace in Christ Jesus, provision has been made for their redemption and sanctification; but we do not understand the Scriptures as warranting their reception into a Gospel Church.

But Pedo-baptists, though they dedicate them to God, as they call it, in infancy, do not admit them to the Lord's Supper. What advantage or benefit is there in being in a Church, yet denied its ordinances and privileges? It is but a system of tantalism, to reduce to intellectual vassalage, the young and inexperienced. Of *the Mother Church*, from her past history, we expect *pious frauds*, and "all deceivableness of unrighteousness;" but we look for something more open and fair from Protestant Christians.

SECTION. X. But suppose we should grant what our opponents claim — that the two organizations are *identical*, and that *baptism* has come in the place of circumcision, and the eucharist in that of the paschal lamb: then to make out their theory in accordance with the requisitions of the New Testament, the subjects must *exercise faith* prior to the administration of the rite. "If thou believest with all thy heart," then *baptism*, not a substitute for it, must be administered; for if we adopt the practice as Pedo-baptists use it, we must first substitute baptism for circumcision, and then *sprinkling* for baptism: but this encumbers the whole matter with too much

substitution. Besides, when qualified in their estimation, they do not bring, or allow their children to come to the Lord's Supper. It may do to assume some things, certain premises, as true; but if our whole argument be founded on assumption, we shall arrive at no sure conclusions. When we assume that baptism has come in lieu of circumcision as a New Testament ordinance, yet practice something else, i. e. assume that *sprinkling* is *baptism*, it lays too heavy a tax on credulity itself.

That Pedo-baptists do not practice baptism as the word is used in the New Testament, is clear as any other truth that depends on Philological research — the true definition of words, as gathered from the most reliable sources — especially from the use in the Scriptures.

We spare you, gentle reader, from a definition conjured up by Baptists — we present the word used in the New Testament as defined by four Pedo-baptists.

"The very word *baptize*, however, signifies to *immerse*, and it is *certain* that *immersion* was the practice of the ancient church." -- John Calvin.

"That immersion was the practice of the ancient church is so plain . . . . that one cannot but *pity the weak endeavors* of such Pedo-baptists as would maintain the negative of it. . . . . As for *sprinkling*, I say as Mr. Blake, at its first coming up in England, 'let them defend it who use it.'" — Dr. Wall.

"It being so expressly declared here, (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12,) that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being buried under water, &c. . . . and this *immersion being* religiously

observed by all the churches for thirteen centuries, and approved by our church," &c.—Dr. Whitby.

But enough. "It is," says Augusti, "a thing made out," viz: the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, *all the writers* who have thoroughly investigated the subject conclude. "I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any *candid* man, who examines the subject, to deny this." --Prof. Stuart of Andover Theological Seminary.

Let us look, for a moment, at the Greek words used in the New Testament in connection with water, as defined and explained by Schleusner, a German Lexicographer:

Baptizo, signifies to dip, to immerse, to submerge. This word, with its derivations, *and no other*, is always used when the ordinance is mentioned or referred to.—Math. iii. 16; Acts ii. 41; Rom. vi. 3, &c.

Louo—to wash to rinse, to bathe.—John xiii. 10.) he that is *washed* (*louo*, the root only is named for sake of brevity) needeth not save to *wash* (*nipto*) his feet." "Hearts *sprinkled* (*rantizo*) and bodies *washed* (*louo*) in pure water."—Heb. x. 22.

Nipto—to wash the hands or feet. (Mark vii. 3, 4.) Dr. Campbell's translation and observations: "For the Pharisees eat not until they have washed (*nipto*) their hands by pouring a little water upon them, and if they be come from the market, by *dipping* (*baptizo*) them." "The two verbs render-

ed *wash* in the English Testament are different in the original. The first is *nipsontai*, (*a nipto*) properly translated *wash;* the second *baptizontai*, (*a baptizo*) which limits us to a particular mode of washing, for *baptizo* denotes to plunge, to dip." Our version destroys the contrast between *nipto* and *baptizo*.

Pluno — to wash garments; (Revelations vii. 14,) "washed their robes."

Eccheo — to pour out: I will pour out my Spirit. Acts ii. 17.

Brecho — to wet, to moisten, to rain. Math. v. 46: "sendeth rain," &c.

Rantizo — to sprinkle: the ashes of an heifer, sprinkled (*rantizo*) — sprinkled (*rantizo*) both the book, &c.— Heb. ix. 13, 19.

If *baptizo* were ever used in the New Testament interchangably with all or any one of these words, Baptists might be led to pause when they insist that the uniform meaning of *immersion* should be attached to it when connected with the ordinance: but neither of the words named, nor any other, is ever used, when the sacred writers refer to the sacrament of baptism. If there were not a special and uniform action meant in baptism, some of those words named above would be used at times: this would spoil the Baptist theory. If in Acts xxii. 16, "Arise, be baptized and wash away thy sins," *a po louo* (*wash*) had been changed for *baptizo*, (be baptized,) the question would stand in a very different light: or in Heb. xi. 28, xii. 24, "The sprinkling of blood" — "the blood of sprinkling," (*rantizo*) we should find the word *baptizo*, the baptism of

blood, or blood of baptizing, so contrary to all the Jewish ceremonies, it would unsettle the whole superstructure of primitive church polity, and disturb principles long ago settled by the profoundest Philologists.

But these words are not thus used indiscriminately. The invariable word *baptizo* and its derivatives, only, are used in reference to the ordinance of baptism. The use by the sacred writers determines the true meaning beyond doubt or question. If the meaning of any term is settled, either in Ethics, Philosophy, Rhetoric, Grammar or Mathematics, so is that of the one under investigation.

Pouring was first introduced about A. D. 250. Dr. Wall, in his researches, finds no earlier record of it than in the case of Novatian, about the *middle of the third century*. This man, while unbaptized, as Eusebius records, (Eccl. Hist. l. vi. c. 43,) "fell into a dangerous disease, and because he was very likely to die was baptized, in the bed where he lay,"— i. e. sprinkled over in bed, or water poured all over him, the word signifies (*eccheo, ecchuo, or echeuno*) to pour upon, to pour out,— "*if that might be termed baptism.*" He, however, recovered, and was a candidate for ecclesiastical office in Rome; but all the clergy and many of the laity, were opposed to his being chosen a Presbyter, because he was baptized, or *poured over* in his bed!! This is Wall's testimony. Hence that monstrous absurdity, *baptismal regeneration*, is the origin of infant baptism.

Salmacius says, "An opinion prevailed that no one could be saved without being baptized, and for that reason the custom arose of baptizing infants."

"We are able to make it appear, by the acts of Councils, and by the ancient Rituals, that for 1300 years, baptism was thus (by immersion) administered throughout the church, as far as possible."—*Bishop Bossuet*, as quoted by Stennet.

"Several authors," says *Stackhouse*, (Hist. Bible,) "have shown and proved that this immersion continued as much as possible for 1300 years after Christ."

Need we be surprised at the introduction of errors, or the change of the Sacraments, as left by Christ and the Apostles, in a period so dark as that which intervened between the 4th and 12th centuries? Hundreds of Pedo-baptists, among whom is Dr. Woods, of Andover, acknowledge there is no authority for the baptism of infants in the sacred writings. If none for *baptizing*, certainly none for *sprinkling* them.

SECTION XI. Take the following considerations as reasons for rejecting the theory of the identity of the two dispensations.

(a) The covenant of circumcision did not require faith and repentance, but descendants from Abraham, claiming admission into the new dispensation, were rejected because they did not furnish those fruits of fitness. (Math. iii. 8, 9.) Hence, fitness for the *old* was not fitness for the *new;* but if they were the same dispensations, those qualifications, which secured admittance into one, would into the other.* "But fitness

---

*Congress shall "guarantee to each State a Republican form of Government, and establish a uniform rate of naturalization:" hence, a foreigner, after so many years' residence in the country, and taking the oath required, is entitled to

or unfitness does not destroy *identity* — faith and repentance are merely new requisitions — the United States might alter the terms of citizenship, yet the government would be the same." *Answer:* Fitness and unfitness imply an *authorized standard* touching qualifications and destroys the idea of *sameness* in two institutions, into one of which, *some* applicants may enter, while *others* cannot be members because of deficiencies. If persons were not *fit* for the new dispensation because its requirements were *higher and holier* than those with which the Jews had been acquainted; the distinction between the dispensations is most palpable. The only external mark of distinction between the Hebrews and surrounding nations consisted in circumcision; and when a heathen would submit to this rite, he became a member of the congregation: nothing else distinguished the Jews from others, and made them a separate people. When the Shechemites were circumcised, they became "one people" with the descendants of Abraham [Genesis XXXIV.] But you cannot fit a heathen nor unconverted persons, educated in a christian country, in *so cheap a way* for the *new dispensation:* the

---

citizenship in any of the States, because their forms of Government are in the main similar, and because the National jurisdiction extends over the whole: he who perceives the spirit of one does also of the other. But this does not hold true in regard to monarchical governments, because they differ widely from a Republic. A citizen in Illinois is not required to be *naturalized* in order to be a citizen of Ohio — the constitutions are the same in substance. But the two dispensations under consideration differ more widely than do a Republic and Imperial government. Hence, Nicodemus, and others in the old organization, had no just appreciation of the nature of the new.

heart must be cleansed in order to understand or see the new reign which Christ has established. The new kingdom recognizes no subjects or members except those with *new hearts* —" exercising repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ," which are not even hinted at in the covenant of circumcision or in the Sinaiatic Law.

A radical change in the conditions of citizenship, alone, would alter the structure of our government; if, instead of the present requisitions, *birth* from certain families of a particular class—profession of a certain religious creed — so much education or so much service for the State, was required; the frame work of a portion of our Constitution would be changed — certain rights, now secured, would be taken away, and citizens, now eligible to office, would be disfranchised. Would not this give, not only a new phase to our government, but make it *new* in one important respect?

In the *one institution* under review, that is, the Jewish congregation, *carnal men* with a mark in the flesh, the only one to designate them from others, are admitted — none are rejected for not possessing higher and holier qualifications; *in the other, spiritual men and women*, in whose hearts God has written his laws and imprinted his image; breathed into them his Holy Spirit; infused new natures, desires and affections, and made them "*new creatures*" in Christ Jesus, are the only ones recognized. How different, widely different is all this from mere circumcision!

Are not these sufficient to constitute a different community? Every subject coming from

the *old* dispensation into the *new*, was of necessity *changed* in all his views and affections. The distinction, then, is most manifest.

Regeneration and faith are radical principles, unknown as requisitions to enter the old economy, but absolute in regard to the new dispensation. In the United States, power is in a President and Congress elected by the people; all citizens are on equality; have equal civil, political and religious rights; taxed by general consent; have no religious tests; all are eligible to the highest offices. In England, whose heavy and unequal yoke of government our fathers threw off, a monarch with absolute privileges by birth, descended from a certain family, rules and his children *are born rulers;* certain dupes enjoy immunities both political and religious; some by inheritance, others by the pleasures of the Monarch; those hold office who profess the religion established by the State. These are radical differences and constitute different governments; those unequal rights conferred at the Sovereign's option, we repudiated and cast them away when we became an independent nation. Ours is a Republic where the people govern and all enjoy equal rights; the other is a Monarchy where a *few* hold the reins. To him who perceives no distinction between the two, a despotism is as good as a free Republic; he is unfit to be an American citizen; disqualified by his ignorance to enjoy freedom. But the distinction between the nature, subjects and condition in the two dispensations before us, is much *greater* than between the two governments at which we have been looking; greater, because all in the new

reign are "born from above," "children of God by faith"—*greater*, because all are *spiritual*, while in all human governments, free or despotic, all may be *carnal* men without any love to God, for no human law can take cognizance of the religious affections. But the high and holy nature required by the gospel, gives it all eminence above human institutions, so elevated, that *comparison* is out of the question; we can *contrast* the two, and this contrast is similar to that we make between the wicked in Sodom and the angels in heaven.

Alter the conditions of citizenship and you change the Constitution—multiply these alterations indefinitely and you have a different government, as we have, from that in England. But the advent of the Savior and the *setting up* of his kingdom in the world, makes the difference between it and the old dispensation, infinitely greater than that accomplished by our fathers in the condition of the Colonies. If there is any meaning in the word *different*, then it appears in the *contrast* we have been endeavoring to bring to view. It might as well be affirmed that Islamism differs not from Christianity because it has certain religious rights and ceremonies, somewhat similar, as to say the Jewish congregation differs not essentially from the church of Jesus Christ. If the distinction is not so apparent and so great as to destroy *identity* and even *similarity;* then there is no difference between a square and a cube—an angle and a circle.

It is said children were in the Old Testament Church, and the warrant to exclude them cannot be found; hence, they have a right to the new.

The Pharisees and Saducees, the most moral of the nation, when they could furnish no better claim than "We have Abraham to our father," were rejected by John, preparing the way of the Lord: that which would exclude one impenitent person or class, would exclude all others. Hence, children are inevitably excluded.

If it should be answered, they had no faith under the old dispensation, yet they were in the church; to this it is replied, their fathers were not required to exercise faith, to be in the Abrahamic covenant—*circumcision* and descent from the Patriarch were all the qualifications demanded; but all, to enter the new dispensation, must exhibit repentance and faith. These are indispensable, as much so as the oath of allegiance for citizenship.

In his Preface to Romans, McKnight, on the controversy between the Judaizing teachers and Apostle, observes: "Affirming that Judaism was the only religion in which men could be saved—that there was no *gospel church* different from the Jewish: on the other side stood the Apostles, and elders, and well-informed brethren, who, knowing that the Jewish Church was at an end, strenuously maintained that a new Church of God was erected, in which all mankind might obtain salvation, by faith, without circumcision; and that the gospel was the *only law of this new church.*"

(b) Those who had been circumcised were also baptized by the Apostles; Paul and others are instances; but if the dispensations are one and the same, the right that secured membership in the one, would be also sufficient to secure it

in the other: when one had been received, it would be a work of supererogation to perform the other.

On the day of Pentecost, the Apostles preached, "repent, and be baptized, *every one of you;*" but if the one rite had come in place of the other, they would have discriminated, and urged only the uncircumcised to be immersed.

SECTION XII. The distinction between the two organizations, appears most clear from the epistles, especially from Romans iv., ix., and xi.

Give the interpretation of Romans xi. 17–28, claimed by Pedo-baptists, *i. e.* that the Abrahamic covenant is here intended, and we see that it is unavailing to save those interested in it, or secure any spiritual benefit. The Jews, as "natural branches" of Abraham, the tree of righteousness, enjoy all its blessings, yet through "unbelief they were broken off," and if "graffed in again," the tenure was so frail, that they might apostatize—there was no security for the salvation of either parent or child, even if they could trace their descent to the Patriarch. But Gentiles are "graffed in among" Jews, (v. 17.) The Abrahamic covenant did not allow this; and they, the Jews, shall be graffed in again, "if they abide not in unbelief;" so that *faith*, *belief* in the Saviour, is made the pivot of salvation: it is as free to one nation as to another: it is a personal matter, and relation to Abraham does not save a single soul. In Rom. iv. 9, the blessedness of forgiveness comes through faith upon the uncircumcised as well as circumcised—to those *out* as freely as to those *in* the covenant. In Rom. ix. 24–30, it is clear God calls Gentiles

as well as Jews, and that the former "attained the righteousness which is of faith," while the latter stumbled on the doctrine of faith, and failed to secure salvation. Now, if the covenant with Abraham does not alter our relations towards God — if the circumcised are as much exposed to his indignation, and liable to be broken off as useless, though *professed*, branches of a righteous tree, and baptism has come in its stead, it possesses no efficacy to save us from apostacy. All the descendants of the Patriarch were in the covenant, but it seems only a remnant of them is saved, and these "according to the election of grace," and not by works or a man's covenant, xi. 5. In Gal. iii., we are assured that "the Scripture hath concluded *all* under sin, that the promise by *faith* of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe"—where "there is neither Jew nor Greek." "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (22, 28, and 29.) It is contended, too, that the covenant with Abraham is the same as that of grace; but the former saves at best only a few, and these Jews; then it follows there is little hope for the salvation of many of our lost and ruined race.

But the gospel covenant, or covenant of grace, secures the salvation of every one interested in it: "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed"—"shall not be confounded."—Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6. It is a better covenant, established upon better promises. Under this dispensation, salvation is not to be secured by reference to any covenant of which man is or

was a party in our behalf: it becomes a personal matter to every believer—not referable to the piety of parents, or dedication to God in infancy. Whether allied to a Jew or Gentile family, *the great requisition is faith*, to the circumcised or uncircumcised.

The Jews, in Apostolic times, were blinded by the same error, supposing that circumcision was necessary to salvation. The matter, however, was put to rest by a council. (See Acts xv.) It would seem the decision made by the Apostles should satisfy Pedo-baptists on this subject, and convince them that the Abrahamic requisitions have nothing to do in the scheme of recovering mercy, as developed in the gospel. If circumcision was declared *innecessary* to salvation, of course it follows that baptism, which is conjectured to have come in its stead, is *also useless*. "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing."—Gal. v. 2. "The circumcised man is a debtor to do the whole law;"—3d verse. If by adhering to the Abrahamic covenant, Christ shall profit us nothing, is it not clear, if baptism has come in lieu of that rite, *that baptism shall work the same detriment*, i. e. stand in the way of our being profited by Christ? What sane man would be willing to subject himself and family to observe the ceremonial law in all its burdensome requirements, and jeopard his hopes of benefit from Christ, the only Saviour of sinners, by adherence to a theory confessedly of no spirttual advantage? It is cheering to learn that thousands of Pedo-baptists in this country perceive the fallacy of this system, and are abandoning it: they fail and refuse to present

their children for the rite — confident, from the workings of the scheme, that it imparts no practical benefit. They are convinced, other things being equal—that is, with the same training, and means which parental solicitude will suggest — that children unbaptized, are as likely to become the subjects of grace, as those who receive the rite in infancy.

It is evident, from Gal. iii. 16, 17, that the covenant conveying *spiritual blessings*, if any, was 430 years prior to the giving of the law, some twenty years anterior to the covenant of circumcision. It is clear, too, from the 16th verse, that "*the promise*," by way of eminence, was not made to Abraham's descendants, but to Messiah: "And to thy *seed*, which is Christ." We are informed (Gen. xv. 6) that he (Abraham) "believed in the Lord, and that he (God) counted it to him for righteousness:" this was thirteen or fourteen years before he was circumcised. Gen. xii. 3, is interpreted by the Apostle, in Gal. iii. 8, to mean the gospel preached to Abraham: "and in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." This was still long before circumcision was commanded and practiced. In the 9th verse, Paul observes by way of inference, "so, then, *they which be of faith* (not those who are *circumcised*,) are blessed with faithful (believing) Abraham." The whole tenor of the Apostle's reasoning, in these epistles, forms an argument against the erroneous notions of the Jews, in clinging to the covenant of circumcision, or to any former enactment that does not include personal faith, in the vain hope of being saved by it — thus keeping them from embrac-

ing the full and free salvation offered in the Gospel.

It is not denied that something of a spiritual nature prospectively is intimated; but the idea that Christian parents can communicate grace to their offspring, is preposterous and anti-scriptural. Would even a Pedo-baptist minister, in proclaiming the gospel to a congregation of sinners, enjoining on them repentance towards God and faith in Jesus Christ, make any exceptions in regard to those initiated into the covenant by baptism in infancy and others? Would he argue that the *former* stood on more favorable ground in relation to God's requirements than the latter? Would he not urge repentance and faith on every one? Where, then, is the benefit of the rite?

Pedo-baptists suppose that the chief object of the Apostle, in Rom. xi. 16–24, is to show that the Abrahamic covenant is represented by the tree, from which Jews were broken off, and Gentiles graffed in their place, and thus became members of that ancient dispensation. But is it not possible to interpret this paragraph without any such supposition? without supposing reference to any organization at all?

Ver. 16. "If the first fruits be holy." The first Jewish converts to the Christian faith are intended, and not the Patriarchs: so, when other Jews are converted, they, also, will be holy. This is McKnight's opinion.

V. 17. If the root be holy, so will the branches. If the early converts be the first fruits, so are they the root and beginning of the New Testament Church; the branches, other

believers, shall also be devoted to God. A tree is in the mind of the Apostle to illustrate the acceptableness of those already brought into the Christian Church by faith; but there is no proof he intended to represent Abraham. "Branches broken off." Schleusner uses the verb *ecclao* or *ecclazo* (see note 2d, in Notes and Illustrations,) to mean *exclude* or *reject*, in this verse; not "break off." The Jews generally were *rejected* from the new dispensation becouse they did not exercise faith, a prerequisite to the initiating ordinance — but claimed baptism from their relation to the Patriarch, which John declared was insufficient to admit them; and the Gentile believers were admitted to become joint partakers with the Jewish believers in the Christian Church—represented by a cultivated olive tree. (See notes.)

Ver. 18. "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." If Abraham be the root, then we have him sustaining a *Gentile* scion or branch, which is unscriptural, except he become a proselyte by circumcision. But the early Gentile converts were not circumcised, but baptized on profession of faith, and graffed into the New Testament organization, represented by the cultivated olive tree, or as branches of righteousness — graffed into Jesus Christ, the true Vine.

19. "Branches broken off" — Jews "rejected," because they did not exercise faith, without which they could not enter the Christian Church.

20. "Because of unbelief they were broken off," or rather rejected; but they were not broken off from the Abrahamic covenant "be-

cause of unbelief," as that covenant did not require belief as a qualification of admission into it; but translate the word "*reject*" from the New Testament organization, "because of unbelief," and the meaning is clear and consistent with other parts.

"Thou standest by faith:" certainly not in the covenant of circumcision, for faith was no part of that covenant; but the gospel covenant demands faith, and this Gentile stands in it by faith.

21. "Spared not the natural branches"—(*kata phusin cladone.*) There is in the Greek no adjective to agree with branches; there is *phusin*, a noun in in the accusative, signifying nature, disposition, habit, governed by *kata*, and *cladone* in the genitive plural: spared, or suffered not the branches to enter the new dispensation, *because of*, or *on account of*, their disposition or nature: they were not fit—did not produce suitable fruit. The Greek word *pheidomai*, means pardon, acquit, hold excused: if God did not hold the branches excused because of their disposition, their infidelity, take heed lest he treat thee in the same way.

23. "If they abide not in unbelief," &c. Jews, if they do not continue to live in unbelief, shall be graffed into the Christian Church. "Graffed in again." *Palin* here signifies likewise, or in like manner; graffed in, in like manner as others had been.

"Abide not in unbelief" cannot refer to the Jewish dispensation, for this did not insist upon faith as a condition of standing in it; only circumcision, the "graffing in" of Jews, must

mean into the new economy, whensoever they believe, as want of it only keeps them from it.

24. If thou, a Gentile, "wert cut out of" a wild olive, *ekkopto*, "cut off:" if the same relation be alluded to as in 17th verse, *ekklao* would be used: cut out, olive, wild or unfit (*kata phusin*) by nature. "Graffed in" *contrary* to nature: where? into the covenant of circumcision? Men's natures were not changed to enter that dispensation, but must be to enter the other, for all the requisitions of the other are contrary to nature, misunderstood and disrelished by the natural man: contrary to nature, too, in this, that a wild and unproductive scion is graffed into a cultivated stock; whereas a good scion, by gardeners, is graffed into a wild stock.

24. *Poso mallon outoi oi kata phusin*—how much more shall Jews, accustomed by habit to religious matters, as the professed people of God, be graffed into a suitable olive—one from their acquaintance with temple and synagogue worship, with which they might be supposed to have more knowledge than a wild and idolatrous Gentile: the Jew must be graffed, as the Gentile, "contrary to nature," (*para phusin;*) but, knowing more of the forms of worship, and something about the one living and true God, if not experimentally, externally; for it must be remembered, "natural branches" are not in the original. *Natural*, the adjective, is made by the translators, out of *kata phusin*, as in 21st verse; but *kladone* (branches) is not in the text: hence the paraphrase, as the only way of reaching the meaning of the Apostle. The Jews, by habit or practice, know more about religious matters than Gentiles.

But the graffing a Jew into the Abrahamic covenant, in which he had been living since eight days old, the day of his circumcision, is a most egregious blunder; but this is the thing intended, if the Abrahamic covenant is represented by the tree or root.

In the 22d verse, the Apostle could not be talking of graffing Jews, "if they remain not in unbelief," into the old covenant, in which they were born, and which he knew was evanescent, about to vanish away: hence, *palin* should be rendered in like manner; as some Jews, the first fruits, had been graffed into the new dispensation — so, *in like manner*, should others, when their unbelief had been subdued. (3. See Notes and Illustrations.)

24. "*Own olive tree.*" The Greek word rendered "own," does not always imply possession, property—but frequently means *proper*, *peculiar*, *true*, *fit*, *suitable:* on conversion they shall be graffed into the New Testament Church, or into Christ, the true and living vine, that sustains and nourishes every real Christian; a tree or church *suitable* to their regenerated nature.

(d) The *nature* of this dispensation, *entirely new*, was disclosed to Daniel some 480 years prior to the advent of the Messiah: "And in the days of these kings, (the Roman powers,) shall the God of Heaven *set up*, (*anistemi*, excito, *surgere facio*, cause to arise,) a kingdom which shall never be destroyed."—Daniel ii. 7. (See Notes and Illustrations.) Christ came to *set up* a *new*, not to *remodel* an *old* kingdom—not to replace or strengthen the crumbling pillars of the Jewish theocracy; but to erect a spiritual

Church, of renewed materials — of persons "begotten of God." If He had been a mere reformer, like Hezekiah, in the Jewish nation, or Luther, whose object was to cleanse the Papacy of its corruptions, and correct its monstrous absurdities — He would have begun by correcting abuses. If his design, or that of his harbinger, John the Baptist, had been to amend or rectify some mistakes that had crept into the Jewish economy, they would have entered upon that work, and attempted a general reformation; but, instead of this, we hear these radical denunciations: "The axe is laid at the *root of the trees*," and those not producing "good fruit, are hewn down;" not that some branches are to be lopped off — some privileges taken away, and others granted in their stead. The stern preacher of repentance does not deal thus tenderly with Abraham's descendants — they must repent, for the plea of relation to good men was of no avail. The new kingdom required *personal faith* of all its subjects, and hence differs widely from the old.

(e) *The types* in the Old Testament furnish an unanswerable argument against the theory upon which we are animadverting. Types are representations of things somewhat resembling them—these are called anti-types. Thus, Adam is called the type, and Christ the anti-type; though the one communicated to his posterity a corrupt nature — the other, righteous feelings and desires.—Rom. v. 14. The Jewish Congregation is regarded as a type of the New Testament Church, which is the anti-type. The tabernacle is the type — heaven the anti-type.—

Heb. ix. 24. The waters of the flood are the type — baptism the anti-type.—1 Peter iii. 21. Hagar represents the covenant made at Sinai with the natural descendants of Abraham; but Sarah the spiritual seed — believers under the Gospel dispensation.—Gal. iv. 21 and 6.

On Peter, McKnight remarks: "As the waters of the deluge destroyed the wicked antedeluvians, but preserved Noah, so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both of these events: the *death* of the sinner is prefigured by the *burying* of the baptized person in the water, and the salvation of the righteous by raising the baptized person *out* of the water, to lead a new life. "They, the Jews, were to be excluded from the better privileges of the Gospel church, of which their ancient privileges *were but types*. Their adoption as the sons of God, were types of believers being made partakers of the divine nature by the renewing of the Holy Ghost."—(McKnight.)

But that which *typifies*, or represents, cannot be *the thing* represented. The tabernacle was a tent, or frail structure: there is no *sameness* between it and Heaven. The image and superscription of Cæsar on the Roman coins, was not Cæsar himself. There would be a *resemblance*, but surely *identity* cannot be predicated of the figure on a coin and the mighty Cæsar. Persons acquainted with him, might discern a *likeness*, a *similarity* in features; but this *likeness* proves the absence of *identity*; *similarity* is the clearest test that no *sameness* exists; for that which is *similar* cannot be the *same*. So the Jewish

Congregation is regarded as a type of the church under the Gospel dispensation, but not the thing itself; the latter is not a continuation of the former; the two are not *idenlical:* hence, all reasoning from the one to the other, on the supposition of their identity, is fallacious and inconclusive. Nothing can be clearer than that, if the *old* economy be a *type* of the *new*, it cannot be *the same dispensation.*

DEDUCTIONS.

The erroneous theory upon which we have been animadverting shows —

1. *How deep-rooted are the prejudices of education in good men.* Presbyterians and Congregationalists, among whom we reckon men of the deepest piety, and scholars of the highest grade, adopt the theory under consideration. They are reduced to this necessity in order to make a show of authority for introducing their children into the church, to plead the Abrahamic Covenant and rite of circumcision. On the New Testament plan of gathering churches, the materials of which are *professed believers* only, no door is open to bring in unconscious babes, and so save them from the horrors of heathenism: hence the supposed analogy of the two dispensations has been assumed to answer their purpose. It is perpetuated from generation to generation—the advocates having been taught from childhood, that the Christian Church is a continuation of the Jewish theocracy, modified to suit the circumstances of the case. The error is so

hoary with age, and so interwoven with all their notions and prejudices, that they suppose it a part of Divine directions as certainly as Romanists believe in the infallibility of the Pope, and the efficacy of the mummeries of priests. If the bias were not instilled in childhood, Old Testament ceremonies would never be called into requisition to prove the duties and obligations of New Testament Christians. I do not question their sincerity and solicitude for the welfare of the rising generation; but reference to God's covenant mercies with the Jews cannot secure the salvation of the posterity of Gentile nations. But I reject their far-fetched inferences and illogical deductions, because they are detrimental to the interests of truth and of a pure Christianity.

But the views of those who hold the theory under consideration differ widely: some suppose the ordinance makes children *members of the church* — others that they are not until they acknowledge the obligations taken by parents on their behalf — others still, that all born in a certain region, where the Christian religion is recognized by the State, become church members by the same right that they become citizens.* Dr. Dwight, answering the objections against children *being in the church*, and yet *not treated* as such — not admitted to the Supper, nor disciplined as members, acknowledges "their opinions with regard to this subject are in a greater

* "I disliked very much," said a German woman in Boston, "to come to America, where I understood there was no religion, because *I was born a Christian!!*"

or less degree *erroneous and indefensible.*" He regards them as "members of the *church general,*" but not "of any *particular church.*"

The federal holiness of children, descended from believing parents, was not the early doctrine of the church. The Catholics maintained that "by baptism remission of sins is conferred;" Zuingle and Calvin taught that "the children of Christians are not less the children of God than their parents under the New Testament, even as they were under the old:" "infants derive sanctification from their parents—they are, therefore, to be ingrafted into the church by baptism." Catholics soon perceived this innovation in the Reformers, and condemned it as heterodox. "This," says Bossuet, "made him (Calvin) broach that novelty, viz: that the children of the faithful were born in the covenant, that is, in that sanctity which baptism did no more than seal in them; and unheard-of doctrine in the church, but necessary for Calvin in order to support his principles." His views are substantially: 1st, That all infants born of believing parents are holy: 2d, That their holiness and salvation do not begin in baptism but are *sealed* thereby: 3d, That unless they were saints and heirs of eternal life *before baptism,* they could not be admitted to baptism, lest the *rite be profaned.*"—See London Baptist Record.

This last article is founded in views more scriptural than the others; for it implies that certain qualifications for the ordinance should be possessed before its administration. This is New Testament teaching, which goes wholly upon the principle that baptism, in the language of the

Episcopal Liturgy, "is an outward sign of an inward and spiritual grace:" but the application of it to such as have not, in the judgment of charity, this grace, is manifestly a profaning of this ordinance of Christ's house. Hence, Baptists have ever opposed the baptism of infants, because they do not and cannot exhibit evidence that they are "saints." Let the attention of Pedo-baptists be directed to these views of Calvin in regard to the *profanation* of the ordinance, when they bring to it unconscious and unbelieving babes.

Look at the following account of baptisms in China among the Catholics: Physicians, women, nuns, &c., go out to baptize children in danger of death. Each year the number of those whom they *regenerate* goes on increasing: in 1839, 12,483 — 1840, 15,766 — 1841, 17,825 — 1842, 20,068 — 1843, 24,381, "winged their flight to everlasting bliss." "One woman baptized 403 in ten months," thus "saving souls at the cost of a most trifling sacrifice." In Mongolia "6,000 pagan children were regenerated on the point of death:" most baptized without the knowledge of their parents. The nun fondles the sick child, "and succeeds in dropping on its forehead a *little water* out of a bottle which she keeps concealed in the long wide sleeve!!"

This is baptism with a witness. Look at it, ye men of God, who practice the same thing in America. See to what ends and for what purposes an ordinance scriptural in its origin, commemorative, and the sign of our fellowship with Christ, has been perverted and profaned.

The Presbyterian Confession of Faith represents "all the posterity" of Adam with a "corrupted nature," and so "made subject to death, temporal and eternal:" "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit." With the doctrine of universal corruption agree both the Episcopalians and Methodists. The high-church party of Episcopalians, or Pusyites, believe in "baptismal regeneration," but very few Pedo-baptists in this country admit an absurdity so monstrous. Generally they repudiate it as unscriptural and dangerous as Unitarianism or Universalism. A Presbyterian minister in *the New Orleans Protestant*, in 1847, shows into what a dilemma ministers are frequently brought in regard to children *at the point of death*, where neither parent is a member of any church. The weeping father implores the man of God, "believing, apparently, that the *sprinkling of water* is essential to the *little one's salvation*. After all assurance that it would *be vain*, the man still entreats, putting all confidence in *the water*, and deeming *faith* on his part as of no moment." The Bishop of Exeter, England, has lately refused to install Rev. Mr. Gorham over a congregation, because he repudiates *baptismal regeneration*, though he had officiated in Derbyshire more than thirty-five years! This decision has been sanctioned by the court to which the case had been carried.

Dr. Bushnell, a Congregationalist of New England, "proves conclusively from their (Congregationalists') writings, that the most eminent advocates of infant baptism, both in earlier and later times, have contended for a *regenerative effi-*

cacy, contained in the ordinance when properly administered."

Some of the Puritans, especially the Brownists, when they first came to this country, entertained very correct notions on some branches of church polity. But in process of time they have been diverted from Bible directions, in the pious hope of bringing their children to heaven. But they have furnished occasion for churches of worldly materials, which could not be governed by Gospel discipline, and would not endure sound doctrines.

Light, however, is breaking in upon us, and many who were educated to imbibe the error censured in these observations, have discovered how illogical is their reasoning, and how much has to be assumed in order to keep up their appearance of consistency.

It is evident that the contradictory opinions above cited, cannot all be *right*, but all *may be wrong*, and probably are so, because they are destitute of support from the only unerring standard, the Bible. Early prepossessions, not scriptural teachings — it is plain to see — have had much to do in these theories; for they must have been instilled into the mind in childhood, or they never would have found a lodgment there. Would so distinguished men, as have been named in connection with this inference, have imbibed such heterogeneous notions, if their faculties had had fair play?—if they had not been swayed into a belief of them when not sufficiently matured to discover their opposite and absurd tendencies, and their entire want of support from the Bible? Hence, their wide-

spread belief must be attributed to the prejudices of education.

2. *It perverts the order of Christ's Kingdom, and annihilates the distinction between the Church and the world.*

Christ's order is, that regenerated persons only, on a profession of faith, shall enter his kingdom; *this* introduces the unregenerate infant, and therefore perverts his order; thus elevating human wisdom above that of the Lawgiver in Zion. But let us beware how we teach, for the commandments of God, the traditions of men. A kind of salvo for the conscience, to mitigate in some degree the severity of expected rebuke, is invented by some in the exploded dogma that baptism *regenerates* the child; hence, they are not only relieved from guilt, but really deserving commendation for the practice. But this is found so false in its workings — so many *baptized infidels* are found, and the hopes of so many sponsors are crushed, that only a few adhere to the theory, and these are papal in sentiment, or reside where little evangelical light has been emitted. Baptismal regeneration is now repudiated by most Protestants in the United States, though it has a stronger hold of the feelings than many parents are willing to acknowledge — especially such parents as have been educated to regard it in some sense connected with covenant blessings, and the Jewish Church continued in the Christian.

But if one unconverted person may be knowingly admitted into the church, so may others, and the whole. Where, then, is the "peculiar people"— the spiritual temple, the sanctified in

Christ Jesus, mentioned in the New Testament, as the only materials of a Christian Church — to be found? The "excellent of the earth," the "beloved of God," become, by our perversion, the synagogue of Satan. The "ground and pillar of truth"— the depository of evangelical religion—loses its distinctive features, and is shorn of its power to do good to the souls of men, when mingled with the worldly-minded and ungodly in church relation. Most unprejudiced persons, though professing no sympathy for piety and holiness, perceive, in reading the Scriptures, that God's people are separate from the world — that they do not amalgamate with infidelity; but in the practice reprehended no separating line is preserved. Can we expect, under such circumstances, that the unconverted will respect our professions, when our practice differs so widely from Bible directions? Ungodly men, it is admitted, creep into churches framed after the Gospel pattern—they did so in early times; but this furnishes no argument in favor of opening wide the door to the vicious, who possess no gracious and scriptural qualifications. If we do—if we invite those unfit for such a relation, instead of fitting them for usefulness and heaven, we foster their pride for dispositions they do not possess, and thus endanger their salvation. When we enroll those *as Christians*, who furnish no evidence of piety and a renewed nature — persons who are in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity, absolutely hostile to holiness, we become accessory to their ruin. If they are too young to make strong exhibitions of depravity, it does not alter the impropriety; they are es-

tranged from God — children of wrath, even as others, and will go forth speaking lies. A thousand baptisms will not change their nature. They grow up in the habit of regarding themselves Christians, because they are in the church, and therefore in no need of repentance. President Edwards remarks, as the result of long and close observation, that, of all sinners, "*unconverted professors* of religion are the most hopeless." The Bible inculcates humility, examination, the fear that we may be deceived: this false system fosters pride and the foulest and most dangerous passions. By-and-by, this class constitutes the majority, and as a natural consequence, they will dislike discriminating preaching—sermons which search the heart and arouse the conscience—which pull away the mask from hypocrisy, and show how unfit are unconverted men for communion with God. But they have been Christians from the day of their baptism; and as did the infuriated Jews, gnash with their teeth upon the Saviour, so will these church members on the faithful pastor. They will seek ministers who "prophesy smooth things," and will not disturb their consciences; they will dismiss the faithful servants of the Lord, and introduce such as will allow them to slumber on in their delusion. If they had not been *accounted* Christians, the case would be different — they might be aroused to see their danger and flee from the wrath to come; but no object is so difficult to move as a person trained up to believe himself heaven's favorite, when a deceived heart has led him astray. The evils referred to, in all their consequences, have been inflicted upon

many New England churches; evangelical ministers, who have tried to discipline refractory members and purify the house of God, have been deprived of their pastoral relation, and *unconverted boys* put in their places.

Satan could not devise a more successful scheme to pervert the kingdom of Christ, and annihilate the interests of truth and righteousness, than the workings of the system have accomplished in New England. But if, with all the piety and advantages enjoyed in the land of the Puritans, so much detriment has been wrought, what would these unscriptural views have effected in a less enlightened and less favored land? Look at the results in continental Europe, and see what ruin a commingling of church and world produces.

Among many Pedo-baptist denominations, *pew-holders*, men that have money enough to purchase or rent a pew, have a voice in all the proceedings of the church, both internal and external; they vote for officers, the minister, and in every act that assembles the body; yet many of them are not controlled by the restraints of conscience or religion—men that visit the theatre and worse places, who drink, gamble, and curse—men that make no *pretensions to heart religion*, but jeer at the idea of regeneration, and mock at the doctrine of evangelical Christianity, as did the Athenians at that of the resurrection. Who has opened this wide door and encouraged the unconverted to take part in ecclesiastical concerns merely because they have *means* and are *fashionably respectable*? Pedo-baptism. All the children, whose parents can be persuaded to have

them sprinkled or christened, make a part of the congregation; and this is Christ's church — his representative on earth! What idea must the young entertain of religion from the examples and practices before them? That it is a mere formal, *fashionable* thing, rather a *farce* than a *reality*, and that the church is an engine to create *genteel* worshippers. If the question should be propounded — where are the excellent of the earth, the saints, the real lovers of God and holiness?— what would be the response? In some places a few aged persons would be designated; but in many, would not echo answer, *where*? The really pious mourn over such a state of things; but they are an *old-fashioned* minority, whose conscientious opinions are despised, and whose influence is as that of a straw in the rapid current of a mighty stream.

The Apostle, (2 Cor. vi. 14,) commands—"Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers;"— "*nolite familiariter uti hominibus a Christiana religione alienis;*"— do not familiarly consort in the Christian religion with aliens or strangers. Many Pedo-baptists explain this as relating to marriage, and maintain that a Christian and unbeliever should never be united in wedlock. But these same interpreters understand 1 Cor. vii. 14, in a different light, by showing that they must not separate, for the unbelieving party is sanctified by the other. You must not enter into marriage with an infidel — be not unequally yoked with such, for (1 Cor. vii. 14) the unbelieving is sanctified by the believer; but if you are in such connection, remain. If it is sinful to *marry* an infidel, is it not also to *continue* the

connection? It is wrong to go into idolatry; but if you are already in the practice of worshiping idols, stay where you are! Now this is the English of this unauthorized interpretation. McKnight, however, opposes this scheme, and maintains that the unbelieving party in marriage is not sanctified by the believer, or that the children of such become *unclean* by separation; for the title of children to be members of the covenant depends not on their parents *living* together, but upon the faith of the *believing one.*

Let us read the paragraph in 2 Cor. vi. 14th through to 17th: "Wherefore come out from among them and be ye separate." Now if the direction in the 14th verse regard marriage, then the 17th verse is a command to annul what never existed, or to separate what God had not joined together; if the marriage relation is the object of instruction, then the 17th verse is a direction to violate it, by leaving husband or wife. But Paul never reasons so loosely. Another thing — the whole tenor of the Bible opposes divorce, except for one sin; the marriage contract is a most solemn one, and fenced from the interference of legislators by a thousand sanctions. But consider the advice given to a church of Jesus Christ and everything seems appropriate. Christians must not associate nor commune with unbelievers or ungodly persons; they are a separate community—"a holy priesthood," forbidden to have church relations with men of the world. Every church that allows it, or does not use means to purge it of such connections, contributes to annihilate the distinction between the church and the world.-(See Notes.)

3. *It circumscribes and enervates the power of the Gospel.*

The primitive churches, as we have seen, were composed of persons that could speak for themselves, and "give a reason of the hope within them with meekness and fear:" they stood in no need of sponsors, or god-fathers, to furnish responses in their behalf: they were "men and women," (Acts viii. 12,) baptized on a profession of their faith in Christ. They received and excluded members — exercised all the rights of competent societies, and performed all the duties enjoined by the New Testament, without the advice or superintendence of prelatical bishops. "Every Christian Church," says Mosheim,* "consisted of the people, their leaders, bishops, and deacons—chose their own rulers and teachers —rejected or confirmed by their suffrages the laws proposed, and in a word, exercised all the authority which belonged to such as are invested with sovereign power." "A bishop, during the first century, was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly. The churches were entirely independent." "A church," says John Knox, (Knox on Toleration,) "is a voluntary society—nobody is born a member of the church —otherwise, the religion of parents, like property, would descend to their children." "All churches were independent of each other." "Every church had its own spiritual head or bishop, and was independent of any other church." "Yet they were each a distinct, independent community on earth." †

*Riddle, Burton, Whately—all Episcopalians.

†Hist. of First Century, pages 87, 91,92.

Constantine, the Emperor, professed Christianity in the early part of the fourth century, "and assumed to himself the supreme power over this sacred body. The bishops began *gradually* to introduce *innovations* into the forms of ecclesiastical discipline, and to *change* the government of the church. At the close of this century (fourth), there remained no more than the *mere shadow* of the ancient government.—Through the changes in the civil government, were introduced among the bishops new degrees of eminence and rank."* "In this century," says a German author, "the clergy were no longer the servants of the people, but a *privileged order*, like the Levitical priesthood, invested by Divine right with peculiar prerogatives." "Heathen ceremonies," says Dean Waddington, "introduced into Christian worship, had, to a certain extent, *paganized* the outward form and aspect of religion." Soon the secular power was entrusted in the hands of aspiring bishops; and the most successful became a temporal prince—a belligerent warrior, and went out with the cross and the sword to make converts to the religion of the lowly Saviour!!

In such a condition, it is not wonderful that the ordinances as left by the Apostles should be changed and multiplied, nor that *baptismal regeneration* should be inculcated as a cheap way to save souls. Nor need it surprise us that the Gospel, once proclaimed as "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven," should, by

*Mosheim on Fourth Century, pages 269, 270.

these mutations and wrongs, *be shorn of its influence and efficacy;* it was too feeble to convert men and bring them back to God. Religion now becomes mere baptism, and it was powerless and inefficient; conversion was only a change from heathenism to nominal Christianity—the mere form without any power. It was advancing rapidly towards a secular throne; dressed up in pomp and magnificence, it did not know itself in its unscriptural disguise. Its professed friends were dazzled with the prospect of worldly grandeur, and forgot their lowly Master and his humble self-denying cause. Conquests were made to the church, but by the allurements of splendor, the dread of imprisonment, and horrible persecution. About the year 600, King Ethelbert, of England professed to be a Christian under the labors of Augustin or Austin, a Romish Monk, and he caused 10,000 of his subjects to be baptized in one day in the river Swale.* Charlemagne introduced religion into many parts of Europe in the same way in 775–6, and 780, he ordered them to be baptised on pain of death;† but it was not the religion of the Bible—the religion that subdues human depravity and makes the heart right in the sight of God; it exerted no salutary influence favorable to piety; it produced no holy lives and no evangelical efforts for the salvation of the soul. It was a mere

*This same Monk tried to Christianize the Welch in the same way, but they would not consent; "Sins therefore ye will not receive peace, ye shall have warre and wretche." Thousands were massacred because they would not give Christianity to their children and observe Easter.—Hague, Discourse, p. 85.

†Mosheim, Eighth Century, p. 481.

tool of the State to wheedle the oppressed people and cheat them out of their inalienable rights, by persuading them of their acceptableness with God. No marvel that in the half dozen succeeding centuries, when the life of religion was gone and the light of science extinguished, that thousands of unscriptural theories should take deep root in the sentiments of an ignorant and priest-ridden people, nor that the gospel should be powerless on the hearts of men.

One of the chief elements of ministerial usefulness— that which secures the listening ear and the understanding heart, is deep-toned piety in the preacher. But this is not and has not been for centuries, the case in countries controlled by hierarchs; hence the inefficiency in their ministrations; they circumscribe the power of the Gospel; they stand in places that should be occupied by evangelical ministers; and truth falls as a dead letter from unsanctified lips upon unfeeling hearts.

Had the churches continued as pure as in Apostolic times, having no unholy incumbrance to weigh them down or impede their progress, in a few centuries their conquests would have spread over the earth, and "the knowledge of the Lord," warming and purifying the heart according to inspired prediction, would have "covered it as do the waters of the great deep." In the discourses of the early preachers there was a power and pungency that few could gainsay or resist. The most depraved and obstinate could not parry the truth as it dropped from the lips of Peter and other primitive preachers; it took hold of the sinner's conscience with so strong a

grasp that he submitted to the claims of the Gospel and yielded his heart and life to God. But so soon as men began to pour contempt upon the Head of the church by legislation — by changing "times and laws" — by accommodating it to the prejudices of the age — by lowering its standard of morality — by adding to its sacraments — by mutilating its external form and spoiling its primitive simplicity, the holy unction with which the early preachers had been annointed was gone — the sword of the Spirit was muffled by the swaddling bands of error and tradition, so that no one was affected and constrained to flee from the wrath to come. Men were persuaded to flee into the church; but, in the language of the Saviour, they became threefold more the children of the devil, than before they entered the consecrated fold. When the bright prospects of wordly grandeur, which allured the ambitions in the Seventh Century to seek after office in the church, dazzled a Prefect of Rome, he exclaimed: "Make me a Bishop and I will be a *Christian too.*" Here was the secret persuasive power of church membership; it was the love of rule and emolument, not of holiness and usefulness in Christ's cause. Protestant Europe is little better than Catholic Europe; her religion at this day is chiefly neologism, transcendentalism and infidelity; the people are born Christians, and "you can not," as Dr. Maclay says, who has lately traveled in that country, "put a member out of the church unless he is hanged!" Christian discipline is unknown; and men, infamous in character and openly profane and vicious, are protected from punishment because

they are in the church, which has the purse and the sword in its own hands.

What influence does the ministry exert for God and holiness, and the salvation of the soul, in all Continental Europe? Most American and English Christians regard religion as so corrupt in the established churches as to be of no real benefit to the people, but rather as a curse than a blessing; it is a mere formal thing—an engine of the State to produce uniformity in sentiment, but powerless as to any saving qualities. Both Romanists and Protestants persecute by fines, imprisonment and death. But a persecuting religion is not of Christ. But evangelical religion, when under the benevolent guardianship of kings and prelatic bishops for a series of years, always becomes powerless. Hence the real disciples of Christ, within the last seventy-five years, have turned their attention to Asia and Africa in the depths of idolatry, as more accessible to Gospel truth than Europe with her religious establishments, her sovereign defenders of the faith, and her mitred bishops with all their secular power.* Men of God, proclaiming the pure Gospel, would not be tolerated: and if they would, the condition of the people is hopeless, unless the Holy Spirit should renew the day of miracles in order to arouse the slumbering conscience and save the soul. Asia and Africa are more hopeful fields for cultivation: they have their "*castes*," their native stupidity, and the cunning of interested heathen priests as obstacles to encounter;

*Since the spirit of Revolution is abroad, religious rights are somewhat respected.

but in those regions the people do listen and do feel the power of simple Gospel truth; they do believe the Saviour and obey his commands with greater alacrity than Europeans, encumbered with a false and corrupt Christianity. In Hindoostan, Burmah, and China, many thousands read and believe the Bible, and follow the commandments of Jesus Christ. The unsophisticated Gospel tells upon the hearts of those who have not been perverted and corrupted by a false religion; it subdues the depraved passions and sways to obedience.

What was the effect of a corrupt Christianity on the Japanese and Chinese in the Seventeenth Century, and what is it now on the American Indians? Does it make them good men? Is there not in Japan an annual festival at which the people trample upon the cross to exhibit their contempt of the religion propagated by the Catholic missionaries? Could they do this if pure religion had taken deep hold of the heart? The Jesuits were charged by the Dominicans with affirming that the primitive theology of the Chinese and that of Confucius "differed almost in nothing from the doctrine of the Gospel!!" Could men, controlled by such principles of policy — resorting to such methods of duplicity and cunning, instead of proclaiming the simple and uncorrupted doctrines of salvation, hope to succeed in making their hearers better — "the sons of God without rebuke?" In vain. The Gospel in their hands, not only from its connection with ungodly men, but from its incumbrance with unscriptural ceremonies, like Sampson shorn of his

locks, was deprived of its efficiency, and was utterly powerless to renew corrupt human nature and bring the sinner back to the worship and obedience of his Maker. Preaching by good men accomplishes little, unless it is accompanied by the prayers of the pious to bring down the influence of the Spirit;—here rest the hopes of God's people. They would yield to despair, in subduing the world to Christ, were it not for the promised aid of this mighty Agent in the regeneration of the heart.

The legitimate tendency of the system we are exposing, is to introduce into the ministry men of unsanctified natures, and hence incompetent to the great work of preaching salvation successfully—a system which makes persons Christians by the application of water, because the rite of circumcision made some members of the Jewish theocracy. If there are good men among classes, as no doubt there are many, it is not owing to the system they uphold, but to better principles that have been engendered by Bible truth with the Spirit's influence.

But all had not apostatized from a pure Christianity in the early centuries after the third; a few, when "the Man of Sin" began to assume power, opposed his progress; but they felt the force of unrelenting persecution, and were compelled for security to flee into the mountains and valleys. In his History of Redemption, President Edwards shows that the people called Waldenses were true worshippers of God in the dark ages, and foretold in Revelation as the woman that fled into the wilderness. Catholic writers describe the Waldensian "heresy as the

oldest heresy in the world," and many authors affirm that they were residing in various parts of Europe when the light of the Reformation first dawned upon the Continent. Archbishop Usher says, that "about the year 1,100, during the reign of Henry I. and Stephen, kings of England, they had spread themselves and their doctrine all over Europe." But as they were an humble pious people, unconnected with the worldly pomp and grandeur that were exhibited by "the Mother of Harlots"—the dominant party that now ruled in church and state, they are unknown in history, and their memory would have perished had not—

> "Persecution dragged them into fame,
> And chased them up to heaven."

May we not trace the love of liberty, which has exhibited itself in almost every age on the continent and in England, to the influence of seed sown by these evangelical men? They preached salvation by grace, and the rights of the people in opposition to prelatical bishops; they took the Bible as their directory in doctrine and practice, and periled life before they would yield liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. When they preached, God attended their ministrations with power, and there was no way to suppress their influence except the sword and flames of persecution—the *ultima ratio* of bigots. These persecuted men, though regarded as unauthorized intruders into sacred service, though not in the legitimate line of regular succession, enlarged the empire of their Master, and made conquests to his cause wheresoever they could find oppor-

tunity to proclaim the Gospel. But who are converted and made real Christians under the preaching of a secularized State clergy? Unconverted themselves, and casting their flouts at the doctrine of the new birth, it is not to be expected that sinners will be made children of God under their ministrations. Thus they circumscribe the power of the Gospel and neutralize evangelical religion.

4. *It connects Church and State, and perpetuates the union.*

"All national churches," says Dr. Wall, "practice infant baptism." "It is morally impossible to rivet the Christian religion into the body of a nation without *infant baptism*."—Hubbard's Election Sermon in Boston, 1672.

National churches exist only where this unscriptural rite is in vogue. You can never unite the two in a country where religion is a personal matter between man and his Maker—where persons become Christians, not by proxy, but by the force of Bible truth, and give themselves to the Lord under a sense of duty and obligation. We may educate the young in the nurture of Christianity, yet under no obligation to fulfil vows made by god-fathers; for this curtails their freedom and abridges their inalienable rights. Promises may be made that they shall imbibe such and such a class of opinions, whereas they may, when beyond minority, entertain those of a very different kind; if obstinate, they are cut off from a church which they never consented to join. Are these freemen? By no means. In so far as you control one's religious opinions, when unable to examine and choose for

himself, you reduce him to a condition of intellectual vassallage; you are fitting him to adopt such sentiments as you see proper to impose, and to submit tamely to your sectarian dogmas, without recurrence to the only standard of truth —the Bible. By such a course has the world been brought to submit to the divine right of kings and bishops; the consequence is the corrupt union of church and state. A cunning priesthood early foresaw that if the masses were to be subject to their control, they must instill into the minds of the young principles of submission, well assured that as "No bishop, no king;" so No king, no salaried priests. But you cannot force this unholy incubus upon a people whose spirit has not been biased and crushed in childhood; taught to put implicit confidence in the *ipse dixits* of such as have an interest in controlling their religious opinions and political rights.

A church of Jesus Christ, constituted and conducted on the pattern of apostolic times, in the transaction of its business, is a valuable school of instruction. Let us see what might have been learned in the early and pure days of Christianity: A member of the church at Jerusalem finds 120 disciples, after prayer for divine direction, "cast lots" for one to fill the place vacated by the treachery of Judas—send Barnabas to aid the brethren at Antioch, a great number of whom had lately believed and turned unto the Lord, and receive and entertain the council that assembled to consult on the exciting question of circumcision. (Acts i. 26; ix. 22; xv. 4.) If he listened to Peter's response to the

Jewish rules, he sees that the right of one, really called of God to proclaim the Gospel, is not subject to the dictation of the civil magistrate, nor is he to be interrupted unless he excite the people to rebellion: conscientious rights of such men are to be respected. (Acts iv. 19; v. 29.)

Were he in intercourse with the church in Samaria, or acquainted with the history of Paul, or with the early members of Corinth, he would perceive what an intimate connection there is between "hearing," "believing" and baptism, and that this was the order in primitive times. (Acts vii. 12, 35–39; xvii. 8; xxii. 16.) If of that at Rome, he would learn the duty of obedience, in civil matters, to the ruling powers; of Corinth, that the authority to exclude and restore members, was in the church; if attached to one of those of Galatia, he ascertains that litigation before heathen magistrates does not become Christians. This is but a specimen of the lessons that would be impressed upon his mind—his general knowledge is enhanced; he can appeal to facts in church polity, and these are treasured up to be applied in similar cases when apposite. "Ye are brethren"—"all one in Christ Jesus"—standing on the platform of perfect equality, having one master only, that is, the lawgiver in the church. Influence depends not upon birth, or wealth, or title, but upon piety and talent, obedience and sacrifices: here is a stimulus to virtue and intelligence. As you wish your own private judgment respected, you will respect that of your colleague in church relation, and forbear to injure his feelings.

But all these lessons are valueless to infant

members—they are incompetent to appreciate them; and when they arrive at maturity, having been introduced by proxy, they feel no interest in spirituality and holiness, and other Christian graces which adorn a church, and render it a blessing. As they have been brought up to follow in the footsteps of their fathers, who had submitted their souls to the safe-keeping of the priests, the children will feel little concern in church polity, or the rights of conscience. Their mental vassallage is worse than the slavery of the body, an hundred fold.

Every New Testament church, is a Republic in miniature. Had not the purity and simplicity of the early ones been corrupted and complicated by Constantine and others, in the neighborhood of every such community, hundreds would have witnessed its proceedings, and imbibed the spirit of soul freedom, which nothing could suppress. These churches in their usual business would convince all who attended, of the truth which kings never would admit, that men are capable of self-government; and there would have been one universal strike for liberty.

Hence Baptists have ever been the objects of hate and dread by tyrants and religious despots, because such men see that the operations of a New Testament church carry death to both civil and ecclesiastical tyranny. Their history is written in the blood and sufferings of martyrs, from that of John the Baptist down to those in Protestant Europe in 1849.*

---

* Baptists have been fined and imprisoned—their children taken by force and sprinkled! Dr. McClay says that in Hamburgh, the authorities refused "a license to women to become *prostitutes*, till they had been *confirmed* in the church!"

In establishing his church upon earth, Christ foresaw that its influence would overturn every despotic government, and He only be King in Zion—the rightful Lawgiver and Head. Had not the corruptions, which we have witnessed, crept in, a few centuries more of primitive preaching, with apostolic power and the workings of the ecclesiastical system, in all nations where the Gospel had been introduced, would have accomplished the purpose. He well knew that kings, at the first, were merely *suffered*, because of the importunity of the Israelites to be like other nations around them. (See 1 Samuel viii.) Before the world is wholly subject to the reign of Messiah, the despots of earth will be as *things that were:* they will pass away under the equalizing power of Bible truth. In so far as we favor the errors and corruptions under consideration, in so far we contribute to perpetuate church and state, and neutralize the force of the Gospel and impede its universal spread. If "all national churches," according to Dr. Wall, "practice infant baptism," and none of the kind exist where this rite does not obtain, it is clear that if it be abolished, this unholy connection ceases—church and state religion is at an end. This unscriptural dogma is the fountain which has sent forth so many streams of error to pollute the purity of Christianity and neutralize its pristine power.

New England, in establishing religion by law, notwithstanding the sterling character of her people, when they fled from the persecutions of the old world, had lost, in one century, much of her pristine strength. Some of her early churches

were formed of the materials recognized in the New Testament; but in order to keep out Baptists, they passed laws blending civil and ecclesiastical powers. Dr. Mather, in about 1700, seeing the dead state of the churches, mingled with the world, had prophesied that their ruin was inevitable. So soon as President Edwards had discovered the error into which he had fallen, that is, that the "*Lord's Supper is a converting ordinance*," his people were so incensed against him, that they would not hear his reasons for a change; and though he published a book, not one of that people would read his reasons! Dr. Finley, a minister of New Jersey, was taken up as a vagrant and carried out of the province of Connecticut, for violating law, *i. e.* preaching in another's parish! Whitefield and Tenant were persecuted about 1740, but through their preaching a great revival of religion prevailed; yet many ministers opposed it with all their might, and tried to disprove the account given of it by President Edwards. (Backus.)

The principles of Roger Williams and his colleagues, in expounding the truth, arrested the workings of the system in New England, else it might have been as cruel as in Italy or Spain. If you could have excluded schools from the country, confined learning to the ministry chiefly, as in popish regions, with the inculcation of the theory we are censuring, upon every juvenile mind, New England, now a bright star in the the American galaxy, might have been as dark and as priest-ridden as Portugal. About a century and a half, church and state were bound together in unholy bonds. Every vestige of in-

tolerance was not effaced from the statute books of Connecticut till 1818, nor from those of Massachusetts till 1834.

The evils of the system had been seen and felt by most denominations, and would have been abolished had they not been steeped in that old bath of superstitious error, "no priest, no religion." If the government did not supply the salaries of ministers and take care of religion, it would wither away and perish—vice and immorality would overspread the land, like the besom of destruction, and civil rights would all be destroyed. Hence, when the law requiring every person to pay something for the support of ministers in Virginia was abolished, about 1784, an infidel statesman exultingly exclaimed, "The death-blow is given to Christianity; in fifty years from this time there will not be a Bible in the United States!" That man must have been educated in a region dark as those blinded by Popery.

At a convention, in September, 1779, to amend the constitution of Massachusetts, an article was adopted "to give rulers power to support ministers,"* and even John Adams, the patriot, whose name is revered by every American, accused the Baptists of having previously attempted, in the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, "to break the union of the colonies!" This charge was refuted at the time. They asked merely for their *rights*—equal religious privileges. Baptists were in the ranks of the army, fighting the battles of liberty, and their

* Backus.

ministers and churches were praying for the success of our cause as devoutedly as any class of citizens. (See Washington's letter to Virginia Baptists, 1789.)

The dominant party, in most of the states where ministers were supported by law, used every effort to prevent its abolishment. In the Connecticut convention, to amend the constitution, in 1818, says a member, "the church and state party did what they could to obstruct all proceedings for the purpose for which we were assembled. The article which met with the most opposition was that upon religion, which secured *equal rights* to all denominations. They plead against the article with much anguish of spirit, and scolded with much bitterness of feeling. No day passed but something was brought forward which had a bearing *against religious liberty;* but God, in his providence, defeated our opponents."*

The odious heresy of Roger Williams was, that civil magistrates had no power over the conscience, and that the origin of all power lies in the people. These opinions are now generally admitted throughout these States, and wheresoever they can be circulated, they are gaining upon the masses, even in monarchical countries. They excited the Hungarians in their late unfortunate struggle for equal rights, against the oppression of kings and prelatical bishops. Who can estimate how much we are indebted for our Republican form of govern-

* Autobiography of Rev. Aschel Morse, Baptist Memorial, 1844—p. 295.

ment—to the principles inculcated by the founder of Rhode Island!" It is clear, from their own laws, blending religion and the state together, that the delegates from New England, unless they were more liberal minded than the ministry, never would have incorporated religious liberty in our excellent Constitution, had not a more catholic and New Testament policy been urged and carried by others—by men who had repudiated the odious dogma of blending the church with the state. If the counsels of New England had been in the ascendancy, we might now enjoy *civil* liberty, but not that of conscience; religious tests, as a qualification, would have been required, and Congress would have been empowered to establish religion by law.* If the connection that obtained in some states had been cemented in all the others, we might now have a king or some monarchical master to reign over us; for in all Christian countries, which practice infant baptism, the connection

* In 1631, the General Court at Boston enacted that no one should be admitted as a freeman to vote for officers, but a member of the church. (Mass. His. Society.) In 1644, it was enacted that those who "either openly condemn or oppose the baptizing of infants, or shall depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, shall be senteneed to be punished." (Laws.) In 1659, two or three Quakers hanged at Boston. In 1668–9 and 70, several Baptists, in Boston, were imprisoned, whipped, and shamefully treated. Dr. Mather, in 1677, maintains that "Anti-Christ advances his kingdom by toleration of all religious persuasions." In March, 1729, two Quakers, two Episcopalians, and twenty-eight Baptists, were imprisoned at Bristol, for refusing to pay taxes to Congregational ministers. (Backus.) Would men, under influences which could tax, imprison, and maltreat others in this way, because they would not support their preachers, vote for a Constitution securing equal, civil and religious rights to all? Let Apella, the Jew, believe it if he chooses.

exists with all its evils; and it would have prevailed over this fair land, unless the New Testament teachings, which put civil and religious affairs asunder, had been inculcated by different minds.

The very existence of monarchical governments is chargeable to the departures we have noticed, from the republican simplicity of primitive times. These are perpetuated through infant baptism, the ground and pillar of Popery—the link that binds together civil and religious interests—a scheme devised to rob man of his dearest rights.

The workings of the system we are censuring have had a fair trial in New England, without king or bishop to interpose lordly authority, or interfere with a people, *right* now in *civil*, but *wrong* in their *ecclesiastical* policy; and what is the result? Unitarianism and Universalism abound. In 1832 some 200 ministers and societies of these denominations were in the New England States. In 1848 the estimate in the American Almanac for United States is 30,000 Unitarians, and 60,000 Universalists, chiefly east of the Hudson River!

In England, more than 11,000 livings are at the disposal of government, gentry and dignitaries of the church. They can dispose of them to their own sons, or others, who may be either "blockheads or sinners."*

The evangelical men in Scotland have lately discovered, in part, the error which we condemn, and have abandoned it. At great tem-

* Rev. Baptist Noel in 1847.

poral sacrifices they have repudiated the right of civil courts to interfere in spiritual matters, and will no doubt complete the work of reformation, and return to New Testament teachings alone in church polity. Let the evangelical, in all countries, surpass her example, and come back fully to apostolical simplicity, and religion would make conquests as rapidly as in primitive times.

It may be asked, why does it not so operate in the United States, where there is no state religion? Englishmen who have carefully examined this matter, freely admit there is more religious influence—that the Gospel tells with more force upon the conscience than in any other country, other things beings equal. But if not propped by law in this country, a portion of the population desire it, especially those whose ecclesiastical policy resembles monarchical governments, which ape the pomp and seek the preferment that obtain in countries where the unholy connection does exist. Beside, we have the heavy *incubus* of infant baptism and infant membership as opposing principles. The creeds of respectable denominations recognize baptismal regeneration. All Pedo-baptists, if they reject that dogma, hurry the administration of the rite upon sickly subjects; thus furnishing a strong probability of a secret belief that mysterious grace is conveyed in the act. Many, too, suppose that none can be saved out of the holy catholic church; others that *ministerial succession* is only with them—some, that infants, if not baptized are in a heathenish state.

With all these antagonistical forces against the simplicity of primitive times, though we have no religious establishment, it should not surprise us — since only a part of the people "contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints," that Bible principles fail to find a lodgement in every mind, demolish every error, and sway every heart to evangelical obedience. No one will aver that primitive Christianity has fair play amidst the opposing obstacles that exist.— Many, however, distinguished for their erudition, their virtues, usefulness and various acquirements, have discovered, after years of fruitless toil, to reconcile the theory under consideration, with the simplicity and efficacy of New Testament teachings — how fruitless have been their efforts—have yielded under the obloquy of the contemptuous, to the force of truth, and abandoned the traditions of the elders.

Look at the workings of church and state alliances in Ireland, where salaries of ministers, till very lately, have been collected by officers and an armed force. Can such ministers be useful to a people, whose goods, whose last cow or article of furniture, must be distrained to raise their salaries? Tithings answered very well for the Jews, because enjoined by the highest authority; but they were never established by the Master in the Christian church, and never introduced by a godly ministry.

What have been the results in all countries where the connection has existed for a dozen centuries? Wars, intrigue, corruption, divisions, schisms, and assassinations in the church; Popes and Bishops, the professed representatives

of the meek and peaceful Messiah, going out to battle for conquests, and the possession of provinces! Heathen Asia, with her hundreds of millions of inhabitants, has not shed so much blood, except in wars forced upon her by Christian nations, in the last five centuries, as Europe, with her expensive religious establishment, constituted to make her virtuous and happy, but really the prolific source of their misery.

5. *It obtunds the moral feelings, and stupifies the conscience.*

Every system which introduces, or allows the introduction of unconverted persons into the ministry or churches, is chargeable for the evils propagated: the Jewish theocracy admitted such classes, for its design and objects were not purely spiritual; but the new dispensation is perverted by those whose sentiments we oppose, and declared to be the same as the Jewish; hence, it is exposed to serious objections, for its tendency is to propagate incurable evils. Many act without regard to honesty of purpose, or the restraints of conscience. Invested with power by the civil government, and bloated with their elevation, they lose—if they ever had any—the humility inculcated by the lowly Saviour, and act more like demons than human beings. A woman, in Cranmer's day, was convicted of circulating Tyndal's New Testament: many, even the King with tears, interposed to save her life; but the mitred Bishop was inexorable.* This is but one instance out of millions that might be named, showing how unrighteous power steels

*Strype's Eccl. Mem.

our nature against the cries of innocence, and obtunds all the moral feelings. But power was in other hands in a few short years, and in Mary's reign Cranmer himself was burned: as he showed no mercy to others, so he found none for himself: his punishment was called a just retaliation.

Do the masses, in countries where religious establishments prevail, and where secular power is lodged in the hands of ecclesiastics greedy of filthy lucre, feel that respect for religion, which obtained in early times, and now pervades the people in these United States? Except the few who enjoy the emoluments and favor of those in power, the great majority hate all that pertains to state-religion: they see that cruelty and blood mark the footsteps of the clergy—they are deaf to the voice of justice and compassion, for dominion has hardened the heart and obtuned the moral feelings. Would they approach such men in time of trouble, for sympathy and advice?

The exhibitions of cruel bigotry in all countries swayed by Kings and Bishops, who would have no existence, if *infant baptism* were abolished, sicken every pious heart, and makes man ashamed of his species. One party is in the ascendant, and all others must submit to its dicta, and bow to its decisions, howmuchsoever the rights of conscience be infringed. It matters not how much suffering the oppressed endure. Only seven or eight Peers opposed the Reformation under Edward the VI.; the same House turned Papists under Mary, the next sovereign of

England.* Now, what cared these men for religion? Were these suitable persons to make laws for Christ and the conscience? Should the cause of the Redeemer be entrusted to such hands? who, one day could extirpate their colleagues on the mere *shiboleth* of party and the next, exhibit the same ferocity to such as refused to change again? Ought such ministers, in whose bosoms every moral sentiment, and all conscientiousness have been extinguished have power over the inalienable rights of conscience? Take one page of the History of the sovereigns of Europe: No, 1st, slain with an arrow: No. 2d, deposed and murdered: No. 3d,—do: No. 4th,—do: No. 5th, smothered: No. 6th, slain in battle: No. 7th, beheaded:—while *righteous* wars, assassinations and persecutions of the worst kind, have wasted and consumed her people.

Is France any better? does her history shed a more favorable light on the workings of the system under consideration? What caused the bloody Revolution of 1791? the oppression of the people by the nobility and clergy, and the writings of such men as Voltaire and Diderot. One of the first acts of the National Assembly, was to confiscate eighty millions of clerical property; the Sabbath is abolished, and the goddess Reason is ordered to be worshipped, instead of the Father of the Universe! Blood flowed in channels. These clergy were either *good* or *bad* men: if *good*, they would not have been treated so unjustly and treacherously by a *Chris-*

*Neal.

tian people; for all France, speaking in general terms, had been baptized in infancy: if *bad*, then it is the legitimate result of the system we condemn, and against which we raise the voice of protestation and warning. Take which horn of the dilemma you please, and the evils are palpable to every eye. But who were the leaders and instigators? The two named were accessory; for they had aided to kindle a flame that acknowledged no limits. Had they not been *regenerated* and made children of God in their baptism? Voltaire's mother was a good Catholic, and he was, without doubt, "made a Christian" in early life. Diderot was educated by the Jesuits, for the church; of course he was not left to the uncovenanted mercies of heathenism: Robespiere was made a scholar through the charities of the Bishop of his native place: Tallyrand was a Bishop himself, prior to his entering upon political life. What was the religious character of Danton, Marat, and other ruling spirits in that dreadful drama, is unknown; but they were doubtless made "*members of Christ*" in childhood, and brought up under the religious training of the country — a country adorned with cathedrals, and crowded with priests. Look at these men, and other Revolutionists; if all had not been baptized in infancy, all had seen the workings of a state-religion, and its natural tendency to make consummate hypocrites, and ferocious villains — in these arts they had been graduated as ripe scholars. If any one requires stronger proof in favor of our position, that the system we oppose is fraught with death to all our moral feelings and sympathies of a generous

nature, let him re-peruse the histories of the two nations just passed under review.

The unholy bonds which enthral the people, in whom lies the power of government, should be severed, and they be restored to rights, long wrested from them by the intrigues of Kings and wily priests. Were it not for the love of domination of those in authority, the change, which true patriotism desires, and Bible teaching sanctions, would be accomplished without bloodshed, and fearful revolution. Let every sceptered monarch and mitred hierarch lay aside their illgotten dominion, and give free constitutions, with equal privileges to every subject: leaving the exercise and support of religion to those who fear God: then every State would have Governors of their own choice—statesmen of pure patriotism, and pious hearers would fill the houses of worship, and enlightened and learned ministers, dependant on their people's voluntary contributions for support, would proclaim a pure gospel in the power and demonstration of the Holy Spirit. The strong inducements which wealth and sway had occasioned, would be annihilated, and pure Christianity would begin anew those conquests, which she was making, when her triumphs were crippled, by blending her with the interests of unholy potentates. One universal anthem of praise to God for the mighty and righteous redemption wrought, would burst forth from every tongue. Earth would hold a rapturous jubilee on account of its deliverance — such a jubilee as has not been witnessed "since the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy."

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

☞ N. B. Repetitions occur on some few points, occasioned by the early plan of the work, which was to be *very small.* But it has been enlarged much beyond the original intention, by finding, on some topics, as the treatise advanced, different versions, and ways of sustaining the various theories of Pedo-baptism, which seemed to require animadversion. This accounts for reference, more than once, to certain points.

Note 1. (See p. 19.) I do not mean to maintain that gentiles were converted on the day of Pentecost and united in the church at Jerusalem, but the language of Acts xi. 2. "they that were of *the circumcision* contended with him," implies it very strongly. For if all the church were circumcised Jews, the distinction, *they of the circumcision* could not, with propriety, be made: no one can resist the inference, that others besides circumcised ones were in the church. If there were *proselytes*, the advocates of this dogma assert that they were *circumcised ;* so this does not relieve us from the force of the inference. Mr. Scott thinks there were *uncircumcised* proselytes, and that Cornelius was such an one. The persons baptized at Cessarea are called "Gentiles;" and it seems strange that Peter should require a most remarkable vision to cure his prejudices about eating with *proselytes!*

When Peter had explained the matter, (Acts xi.) the exclamation was joyously made, "Then hath God, also to the Gentiles, granted repentance unto life." This is quite sufficient.

On the 4th chapter of Galations, McKnight observes, that "Ishmæl, begotten by natural strength," was a type "of the then present Jerusalem church," children of Abraham "merely by natural descent." "The covenant of Sinai rendered all its members *slaves;* that from Mount Zion, (see Isaiah ii. 3d.) the Gospel covenant, by abolishing the Jewish church, and uniting the Christian church, makes all its members *freemen and sons.*" The Spiritual Jerusalem, believers of all nations, are typified by Isaac, and his mother, Sarah, who brought him forth supernaturally, by virtue of promise." "Their (the Jews) adoption, as the sons of God, (*nationally*) and the privileges by that adoption, were *types* of believers being made partakers of the divine nature. Abraham's seed, by Isaac — were types of the invisible Church. (On Romans ix.)

Note. Some writers, though they maintain the Sinaiatic covenant was abrogated, (see Heb. viii.) the Abrahamic was not, but is still in force: this is the prevailing opinion among the Jews, as they yet practice circumcision, and look forward to the period when they shall be put in possession of their ancient inheritance, Canaan, secured to them in that covenant, as their perpetual possessions.

But to make this covenant the same as the covenant of grace, having been begun in Abraham, would cut off the hopes of all the pious

who existed prior to the Patriarch. On this theory, Abel, Enoch, Noah, and other worshipers of the true God, for two thousand years, had no ground of confidence for salvation — they must have inevitably perished in their sins.

NOTE 2d. Opinions of Schleusner and Rosenmuler, on Romans, xi., 15, 24, (15v.) *Apobole:* "metaphorice usurpatur, ut sit repudiatio, et iis tribuatur, qui non in familiam et populum Dei seu coetum christianorum recipiunter. Sic legitur Rom. xi. 15. ubi *to apobole*, quod de Judæis usurpatur, qui ipsi incredulitate sua commodis et jure civitatis christianæ se privaverant, opponitur *he proeleepsis*, h. e. receptio in familiam Dei christianam. — Schleusner. Rosenmuller's words are: *Apobole*, rejectio, per metonymiam effectus pro causa, est contumacia Judaeorum, propter quam a Deo rejecti sunt, idem quod *paraptoma*, in v. 11, 12; et *apistia* v. 20. See p. 43.

(16.) Ostendit Apostolus etiam Judæis reliquis aditum patere ad gratiam Dei, si ad Christum convertantur et ad hanc rem illustrandam utitur non nullis similitudinibus. Si primitiæ sunt sanctæ (Deo consecratæ) etiam massa est sancta, i. e. humano usui permissa.———i. e. sine peccato iis vesci licebat. Cum *primitiis* comparat Apostolus eos, qui primi crediderunt in Christum, et fuurunt Judæi; cum *massa* comparat religuos Judæos, nondum conversos. Sensus igitur est; Quum Multi Judæi per Fidem in Christum jam sint oblati vel concecrati Deo, etiam reliqua pars populi recte potest vocari ad regnum Christi. Rosenmuller, (17) Schleusner in loco says in regard to *ekklao:* i. q. *ekkopto* cum quo vocabulo permutatur, Rom. xi. 17,

19, 20, coll. v. 22, in quibus locis tamen metaphorice adhibetur ad designandam exclusionem Judeorum incredulorum e populo Dei, quos in antedecentibus cum ramis oleæ comparavrat apostolus. On *ekkopto*, his words are, (2) metaphorice excludo aliquem e societate et coetu, et adhibetur, ut *ekklao*, ad designandem exclusionem evero Dei populo e numero verorum Dei cultorum. Rosenmuler, on 17 verse observes, Sic etiam Judæi increduli tunc temporis a juribus populi Dei exclusi sunt.

Indicatur hac similitudine conjunctio gentilium cum vero populi Deo, ecclesia christiana nempe, quæ ab initio nonnisi ex Judœis constitit.

Romans xi. 15. Translation of the above: Metaphorically, it is used so that repudiation may be, and is attributed to those who are not received into the family and people of God, or fellowship of Christians. Thus it is read in the New Testament, Rom. xi. 15, where, to the casting away, which is used concerning those Jews, who, through their own unbelief, deprived themselves of the advantages and right of Christian society, the reception is opposed; that is, reception into the Christian family of God.

The casting away, the rejection, by metonomy, the effect for the cause, is the contempt of the Jews, on account of which, they are rejected of God; the same as *fall* in the 11th and 12th verses and *unbelief* in the 20th.

16. The Apostle shows also, that for the remaining Jews, a door is open to the favor of God, if they shall be converted to Christ, and to illustrate this fact, he uses certain similitudes.

If the *first fruits* are holy, (consecrated to God) so, also, shall the whole mass be holy; that is, allowable for human use; — that is, it is lawful to eat them, (the fruits) without offence. With the *first fruits*, the Apostle compares those who first believed in Christ, and were Jews; with the *mass* he compares the remaining Jews, not yet converted. The sense, therefore, is, since many Jews had now been offered, or set apart to God; also, the remaining part of the people, can rightly be admitted into the kingdom of Christ. 17. The same as ekkopto, in the place of which it is used, in Rom. xi. 17, 19, 20, compared with 22d, in which places, it is employed metaphorically, to designate the exclusion of the unbelieving Jews from the people of God, whom, in the preceding verses, the Apostle compares with the branches of an Olive tree. On ekkopto, Schleusner says, in the second meaning, I exclude any one from society and friendship, and is employed as ekklao to designate exclusion from the true people of God, from the number of the true worshippers of God. Rosenmuller says on 17th verse: So, also, the unbelieving Jews, thence were excluded from the privileges of God's people. By this similitude, the union of the Gentiles with the true people of God, is indicated, namely, the Christian church, which, at the first, consisted of none but Jews.

(See p. 51.) *Kata phusin*, is not eleswhere used for the adjective *natural*, in the New Testament; but where *natural* is found in our version, the regular Greek adjective *phusikos*, is employed. (See Rom. i. 26, 27.) In Montanus Edition of 1584, and Leusden 1806, the

words in Rom. xi. 21 and 24 are, "secundum naturum ramis" and "quanto ii qui secundum naturam inseruntur." Schleusner gives a dozen meanings to *Phusis*, among which are, "native force," "instinct," "disposition," "custom," "habit," &c. Dr. Barnes, on the 24th verse, speaking of the Jews, says, they "have a *habit* of *professed reverence* for the will of God."

Between the word *exeklastheesan* rendered "broken off," 1st, aor. pass. and *execleistheesan* which signifies to *shut out*, *exclude*, *reject*, there is but one letter's difference; and I ask, if this mistake may not have been made by the transcribers? It would be very easy to compress *alpha* of the first verb, into *epsilon* and *iota*, of the last; and thousands of supposed mistakes, much larger as the learned well know, are corrected by the critics, without any authority but their own judgments. *Scapula* has *Klao*, frango; but the compound verb, ekklao, or ekklazo, is not found in his learned work.

Palin:—Jews, as *natural branches*, can not be said to be "grafted in again: for *Palin* implies a former engraffing, which cannot be predicated of *natural branches*; hence, the true rendering of *palin* is, *likewise*, in *like manner*. But, was it ever known, that a "*natural branch*" was *broken off* and then graffed into the original stock or tree? Yet this must be the case according to the interpretation of Pedo-baptists: for these branches after having been "broken off," continue in a withering, dying state, "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in;" then they are to be graffed again into Abraham

> This theory exceeds the finesse of Jesuitism, which thinks it altogether proper to *do evil* that good may come to "mother church" —to replenish her coffers, and give currency to her traditions and miracles. We can admit the teachings of the Bible, though above our comprehension, where the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the scheme of recovering mercy is concerned; but it staggers credulity, when a hypothesis is to be supported, which outrages common sense, and violates the laws of nature.

The comparison, to say the most of it, is between nations, or of persons capable of showing *unbelief* and *faith*, hence not including infants; neither of which is like the Christian church, a *spiritual organization*. In Rom. iii. 22, 27, the Apostle shows there is "no difference" between Jews and Gentiles—the only condition of salvation is saving faith in Christ Jesus, and relation to the Patriarch is of no avail. Hence *branches*, if they do represent the descendants of Abraham, though honorable in ancient times, possess no qualities by nature to secure the favor of God, under the Gospel dispensation. It is dangerous to confide in a theory which hinges the safety of the soul, on relation to any except the Redeemer. Most commentators—Stuart, Scott, Barnes, and others—though they give "broken off," as the rendering, as it is in our version, on which they make no criticisms, generally use, in speaking of the Jews, in these verses, "reject," or "exclude." "Have been *cast off* because of their unbelief:" "*Rejecting* the Jews." "The present *rejection* of unbelieving Jews." "Un-

belief the ground of their *rejection.*" "Utterly *reject* them." "If the *rejection* of the Jews." Stuart.

Again the difficulty is insurmountable in regard to Gentiles graffed into the Abrahamic covenant; for the law* in regard to strangers is, "Let his males be circumcised," without which he could not come near; but the Gentiles were not circumcised in apostolic times, and hence could not approach and derive any benefit from that covenant. It is assumed that baptism has come in lieu, and that *baptized Gentiles* sustain the same relation to the Patriarch as did the Jews; but this is merely assumption—there is no Scripture to support it.

On Rom. xi. Mr. Scott says, "Abraham was the root, as it was, of the visible church in all ages. When any Gentiles were proselyted, they were *graffed into this tree*, by circumcision." On the 16th verse, McKnight observes, "The Jewish nation were made the visible church of God, by virtue of the covenant of Sinai. The thrusting them out of the covenant of God is represented by the breaking of the branches."

But it is clear from Rom. xvi. 5, 1 Cor. xvi. 15, James i. 18, and Rev. xiv. 4, that *first fruits* mean the first converts in a place to Christ: if we take the Bible to be its own best interpreter, this is the true meaning in the 16th verse, and Abraham and the Patriarchs were not intended as "*first fruits*," as many contend. The 17th verse is but a continuation of the same subject, and the similitude to represent the same persons.

* Exodus xii. 48-9.

The Greek word *riza* signifies *stem*—*rod* as well as *root*—also *origin*, *foundation*. The first converts were the first fruits; so they were the root or origin nucleus of the Christian dispensation. Other converts were the branches or parts of the superstructure. In John xv. Christ represents himself as a vine and his disciples as branches; but it is certain not *natural* baanches. They must have been graffed into him; so these converts at Rome were engraffed into Christ, but not into Abraham nor the Sinaiatic covenant.

Neither the covenant of circumcision, nor that at Sinai, know anything about *engraffing*—this word is not used in relation to either—hence, Mr. Scott's theory is a mere postulatum. If they represent Abraham as a root or tree, the branches were introduced by *national right*, by birth and circumcision; but the connection mentioned in this chapter is by *engraffing*, and hence cannot relate to faithful Abraham.

But engraffing into *a covenant*, or into a tree, the representation of a covenant is unknown in the Bible. Nor is there any representation of *breaking off* from a covenant. The Jews *break the covenant* by their wickedness; but *breaking them off* is not found except in this chapter, and this is believed to be an erroneous translation of the Greek verb *ecclao*. Hence, we cannot regard the "olive tree" as designed to shew forth Abraham and the patriarchs, but the gospel dispensation from which the Jews were *rejected* for their unbelief; while real believers were engraffed into it, contrary to nature, by the gracious influence of the Spirit.

The inquiry arises, what "*fatness*" (see verse 17th), would accrue to a Gentile by being graffed into the covenant of circumcision? The Romans converted in A. D., 60, could not derive any *fatness* from circumcision pronounced in 1 Cor., vii, 19, to be "nothing." The Jewish ceremonies in Apostolic times are regarded as burdensome rites, not valued as imparting gracious or spiritual qualifications; hence, when we represent them as dispensing *fatness*, or blessings to advance us in the favorable regards of Jehovah, we transcend sriptural bounds and safe interpretation.

We see the Gentile, in the subject under consideration, was graffed, "contrary to nature," into a "good olive;" but circumcision was not contrary to nature; it was a simple act to which submission was enjoined, without any change of heart; hence, the engraffing was not circumcision, but something above it. In the 25th verse, "till the fatness of the Gentiles be come in:" Where? Into the Jewish congregation and Abrahamic covenant? Let McKnight answer: "Till the general conversion of the Gentiles takes place—come into the Christian church: the reconciliation of the world or Gentiles, is the same as their *engraffing* in the 17th verse." This throws clear light on the meaning of engraffing: it is equivalent to regeneration or conversion, as both McKnight and Scott admit; therefore, it has no allusion, as Mr. Scott supposes, to engraffing proselytes into Abraham as a tree by circumcision. The coming in of the Gentiles, in the 25th verse, must be into the same *state* or *condition* as that into which some were engraffed in the 17th: *i.e.*,

into a state of salvation; for it is said in connection, "so all Israel shall be saved." But engraffing by circumcision does not save.

(*On Romans XI.* 15, *&c.*)

"15th verse—i. e. if the *rejection* of the Jews on account of their unbelief, &c." Prosliepsis is the reception to favor, i. e. admission to the family or church of Christ.

20. Thou, (a Gentile) retainest thy present condition only on the ground of faith, or belief in Christ.

22. The present *rejection* of unbelieving Jews, is by no means final and exclusive.—Prof. Stuart on Romans.

Rom. ix. 6. The *rejection* of the Jews is agreeable to God's former dealings with them; for all the descendants of Israel are not of the true Israelites. Therefore, he now acts in the same manner by *rejecting* the unbelieving Jews.

xi. 1. With respect to the nature of the *rejection*, the Apostle, speaking in the name of a Jewish objector, whether it will be total and universal.

11. The *rejection* of the Gospel by the Jews. (which was the cause of their *rejection* by God) was the means of salvation to the Gentiles.

15. The best commentators are agreed, that *apobole* (casting away) is used by a metonomy of the effect for the cause, to denote the obstinate unbelief which caused the *rejection* of the Jews.

16. The meaning is well expressed by Schoeltg and Carps, as follows: If now, a great part of the Jews, at the beginning of the new covenant, have, like *primitial offerings* of good

fruit, been received on account of their faith, into the church of Christ, and made partakers of justification, &c.

17. Branches, though from a good trunk, yet when broken off are valueless. Bradencamp says, it was common, in early times, to engraff *wild scions* upon a good stock.

18–20. If some of Abraham's children were cast off for their unbelief, God, by casting off the Jews, has made room for me, a Gentile. But it is by faith only that thou standest.—Bloomfield.

I do not find ekklazo ekklao, the word rendered "broken off," in the New Testament, except in these two or three verses. The Hebrew word *shawpa*, to which ekklao answers in the Septaugent, is used in Leviticus, 1. 17,—Judges xiv. 6, and probably, other places, signifying divello, separo—to rend, separate, &c. But on careful research, I arrive at the conclusion that commentators and Lexicographers may have mistook the meaning. It is possible that they may have been biased by the theory of the identity of the two organizations, which we are endeavoring to show are not the same. In other parts of the Epistle and chapter, the *rejection* of the Jews, is clearly stated, as will be seen by these illustrations and quotations. These show clearly that *rejection* is the true meaning. (s.p.55).

Note 3d. Anistemi. Prof. Stuart, on Romans xi., 20, "to establish, to constitute, set up, etc." In the Septaugint it answers to the Hebrew verb, Koom, and is used in Deut. xviii., 18, I will *raise them up* a prophet: so in Acts iii. 22, "a prophet shall the Lord God *raise up* unto you." But the use in Homer is *decisive;* where

the sense is to raise, rear, erect buildings, altars, &c. (Donegan's Lexicon). This is quite sufficient for our purpose, and shows most clearly, that a verb used to express the erection of buildings and altars, has force enough to signify what Daniel declares it to mean, when he says: "the God of Heaven shall *set up* a kingdom" — not modify and patch up an old one — not merely breathe life into the Hebrew congregation; but erect a new and spiritual organization — all of whose members shall be capable of worshipping the Father in spirit and in truth.

Mr. Scott observes, on Daniel ii. 44–45, "In the days of these kings, or during the prevalence of the Roman authority, the God of Heaven had determined to set up another kingdom. The stone was entirely distinct from the image, nay, distinctly opposite to it in all its interests; it must therefore mean a kingdom, set up by the power of God, without the concurrence of human policy or force, and in opposition to all the authority and combined efforts of the princes of this world. The kingdom of Christ was evidently intended."

Let us test the soundness of the Pedo-baptist theory in regard to the Abrahamic tree, as mentioned in Rom. xi. 16, 24, by a well known chapter in the history of our country. Let the Jewish nation, branches, &c., represent the several parties in our Revolutionary struggle.

16. *First fruits*, the first patriots, Englishmen by birth, or in all their loyal feelings, friendly to the mother country; but they felt she was doing wrong in her oppressions, and

hence deserted her interests for those of their own adopted country, in the Revolutionary struggle for freedom. If the *first fruits* be devoted, or set apart to the cause of the Revolution, the masses in the colonies, when they see their own interests in a true light, will also go for liberty or perish in the attempt. If Adams, Hancock, Henry, Lawrens, Hall, &c., be determined on the overthrow or desertion of the old government, so may we expect the rest of the nation will engage heartily, in the same glorious enterprise.

17. If some branches, the tories, the enemies of the country, and foes to its advancement, on account of their "unbelief" in the ability of America, to control herself and be an independent government, were *rejected* from the army and places of trust, (for some beside Arnold were the professed friends of the American cause, for a time,) and thou a Gentile, an Indian of another stock and tribe, wert united with the army to fight for American Liberty.

18. Let not this savage, wild by nature, unaccustomed to a civilized government, boast against the tories, the *rejected* branches, the unbelievers in the triumph of the American cause; for thou dost not sustain the root, the American government; but it sustains thee and pays thee for services in her behalf.

19. It is true that branches, tories, were rejected, that I, a savage, might be united with the new interest.

20. Because of unbelief, want of confidence in the cause of liberty, they were excluded, and thou, an Indian, a Gentile, standest by thy confi-

dence in the cause of the American people, and the righteousness of their enterprise. Be not high minded, Indian, for our cause depends upon confidence in God, and the patriotism of the people.

21. If God, the Governor of the Universe, who is represented by the American Government, spared, or suffered not the colonists, that adhered to England, and for want of confidence in our behalf, abused the Revolution and all engaged in it: take heed, for if thou failest to cling to the new interest, it will also reject thee.

22. Behold the goodness and severity of the government: on the tories, that betrayed their country, severity and confiscation of property; but towards thee, goodness and protection.

23. If the tories continue not in unbelief, they shall be incorporated with the nation; for the government is able, in like manner, as it incorporated the first fruits, the early patriots, into their cause.

24. For if thou, a savage, taken from the wildest tribes, wert incorporated with a civilized nation during the seven years's war, though by habit unaccustomed to civilized life, much more shall the tories be incorporated with us, when they shall have abandoned their prejudices and unbelief in our ability for self-government.

But let us give it the interpretation which Pedo-baptism adopts. First fruits are the early emigrants, as representatives of patriarchs: if they are loyal to Egland, so will be the rest of the nation, devoted to the interests of the mother country: if the root, the Puritans, be set apart

to maintain the safety of the tree, England, so will their posterity.

17. If branches, the tories, be broken off from England, and thou a savage, wert graffed into England, into her army and government—but were the tories broken off from England? No, this class adhered to her all through the war, and escaped from America as by the skin of their teeth.

18. Thou bearest not the root, England, but England sustains thee, a savage.

19. The branches, tories, were broken off that the Indian might be incorporated into the English army and nation. Was a savage better than a friend by birth?

20. Well, because of unbelief in the strength of England, the tories were "broken off," and thou, an Indian, standest by confidenae in that country. (Were tories broken off from England or rejected by the American Government? Thou, a savage standest by faith? Where? In England? Certainly not, but in the new government.)

21. If England spared not the tories, she will not spare thee, a wild savage: If thou showest any signs of unbelief in England's power she will not spare thee.

22. Behold the goodness and severity of the English Government: severities on the tories, loyal subjects and foes to the new enterprise—goodness to thee—lying in ambush to destroy her armies.

23. If the tories abide not in unbelief of the power and justice of England, they shall be graffed into England, to which they had adhered

all through the contest with unceasing attachment; the government is able to graff them in, or incorporate them again into the nation! (But the tories were never separated in their affections from England — never were broken off — never lost confidence in her power: hence, to talk about graffing them into England again, is to make sad work. But if Abraham or England be the tree, this is the result.)

24. How much more shall the natural branches be graffed into their own olive tree! that is, tories, broken off, which were not broken off, shall be graffed into England again, to which, all through the Revolution, they clung with death-like tenacity!

The following are among the incongruities of the Pedo-baptist interpretation: Branches are "broken off" the Abrahamic tree, and then graffed in again: the Gentile is graffed into the Jewish Church, where he could not enter without circumcision: — broken off branches, dry and worthless, are graffed into the tree to grow, when it is true that such scions or branches soon die out of a tree: broken off, too, because of unbelief, which the Abrahamic covenant did not require to enter it: an uncircumcised Gentile drawing sap and fatness from a Jewish tree, which feared pollution from the touch: natural branches, broken off for want of faith, which formed no part of the covenant of circumcision, yet a Gentile standing in this covenant purely by faith with "natural branches," on which there was no requisition in order to be engraffed, or to hold their position!

It is foreseen that a caviller might change the representation so as to make the patriots take the place of the tories and Indians as allies to England: Well, let the patriots be broken off from England, and be graffed in again when reconciled. Then it will be true that the Revolution failed—that no new government was set up, and we, as a people, are yet under British sway? This will be the result, if the representation which a caviller might suggest, should be true. But there is a new government, giving equal privileges to all—the rights to preferment depending not upon *birth*, but upon virtue, intelligence and personal worth. An enemy only to our country, or one ignorant of history, could make a false representation.

A new kingdom has been *set up* by the God of heaven; the disciples were the *first fruits* from the Jewish, and Cornelius from the Gentile nation: unbelievers, whether from Jew or Greek, were rejected from the new dispensation: all entered upon their own *personal* faith, not by parents or proxies, as under the old covenant.

"Gentiles had been graffed in upon the *Jewish Church*:—for, after all, the *Jewish Church* is the only stock on which the *Christian* has been engraffed."—Prof. Stewart on Rom. xi. 17, 18.

In looking into the Hebrew Church, and State system, as described in the acts and the spirit exhibited by the majority of the nation, I am constrained to come to a very different conclusion. This obtained all over Judea when Christ came upon earth. He announced his intention of erecting a *spiritual* edifice, accessible only to

spiritual worshippers. After some three years' public labors and instructions, the number of his disciples was very small: they were Jews by birth, education, and civil and ecclesiastical relations; but had become believers in Christ, his friends and worshippers. But this small fraction of the nation, which adhered to the Saviour, were, like their leader, despitefully used and maltreated by the great majority of the Jewish people: some were put out of the synagogues for acknowledging confidence in the Messiah — He, the master, was cruelly put to death at the instigation of the Jews — persecution raged against all that named the Saviour, or adhered to his principles. Soon after the day of Pentecost, most of the disciples dared not remain in Jerusalem, the seat of Jewish power, because of the virulence of persecution, excited by those highest in authority. Peter, a disciple, charges the guilt of the murder of the Saviour upon the men of Israel: the priests and Saducees came upon Peter and John, while preaching the new religion, imprisoning them, and ordering them no more to speak in his name. When released, "they went to *their own company*." "Believers were the more added to the Lord, both men and women." Stephen is stoned, and Saul, a zealous member of the Jewish church, consents to his death. This same personage "persecutes the Church of God and wastes it:" he breathes out threats and slaughter; but on his way to Damascus is converted, and when he tries to join the disciples, they are afraid of him. Forty Jews bind themselves by an oath to kill him.

From the above account, I cannot resist the conviction, that the Jews as a body, and the disciples, were distinct and opposite parties — antagonistical in all their views and feelings — the former persecuting the latter with all their might, calling in the aid of the Romans to thwart their plans, curtail their influence, and take their lives. Could these few disciples be members of the *same church* with the persecuting Jews? men that had crucified the Lord of Life and Glory?

So soon as Gentiles were converted and united with the Church of Christ, they were as much the objects of Jewish persecution, hate and detraction, as were those who had deserted the Jewish theocracy. Indeed there was no affinity, no sympathy, between the Jews and disciples of Christ. With all my respects for the learned Professor of Andover, and thousands of his pious and useful brethren, I must express my disbelief in the sentiments he has advanced; "Gentiles graffed in upon the Jewish Church!" Would a people, that had crucified the Saviour, and were then persecuting, with the malice of fiends, his few and feeble followers, invite them into church relations with them? I conceive no proposition can be more monstrously absurd, or egregiously erroneous. To affirm the people of Boston, on the 5th of March, 1770, after the British troops had fired upon and killed four citizens, were "engraffed in upon" the army, and took part with it, would, in my opinion, be no wider from truth and fact. Or that on the 17th June, 1775, when the British were passing over to Charlestown, storming the en-

trenchments of the Americans, and shooting down their patriotic soldiers—any one should aver that the two armies were one in sentiment and feeling. Was that repulsed, though unconquered handful of patriots, engraffed into the British nation and army? So true and certain is it, to my mind, that neither Jewish nor Gentile converts were engraffed in upon the old Jewish stock.

The Saviour said to his few disciples, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom:" Was his meaning to give them the *Jewish Church*, and make them distinguished members in it? Paul says, "I persecuted the *Church of God*, and wasted it." Now, if the Jewish congregation, in Paul's day, was the *Church of God*, when he was arresting the disciples of Christ, the church was not with the Jews, else then God *had two Churches*; but there never was but one *true Church* on earth at the same time: it follows, then, that the true Church was that composed of Christ's disciples, which Saul was persecuting. Into this both Jewish and Gentile believers were engraffed, and not in the old Jewish stock.

When Saul was converted, he entertained new views and feelings, and would not remain in the Jewish Church, among his kinsmen according to the flesh: he sought the company of the disciples, though "they were afraid of him." It is admitted that Jewish and Gentile believers were united in church relations: but would the Jewish church — where he was educated, of which he was so distinguished a member, and for which he labored so industriously to suppress the new

religion — be afraid of one of their champions? Paul and Silas direct the jailor, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." But to enter the Jewish congregation, all that was necessary, was to exhibit evidence of circumcieion, and proof that the candidate was descended from the Abrahamic family. Hence the distinction between the two is most obvious. If Scribes and Pharisees, the most prominent men in the Jewish congregations, had been inquired of as were Paul and Silas, Sirs, what must we do to be saved? would they have answered, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ?" By no means. "Ye must be circumcised and keep the Law," was the very language which Jewish preachers had proclaimed at Antioch. (see Acts xv. 24.) We might expect similar directions from unconverted Scribes, who did not understand the doctrine of salvation as taught in the New Tastament.

Forty Jews bound themselves by an oath to massacre Paul, after he began to preach Jesus as the Messiah: but if, when he joined the disciples, he merely united with the Jewish church, then it follows that this church was a very corrupt concern, for it had murdered one of its own members! Peter and John, after their release from arrest by the Jewish priests and Saducees, "went to their own company" — the Jewish church! "Saul made havoc of the church" — Jewish, of course, for God has but one church on earth.

These absurdities might be increased, by reference to the New Testament, *ad infinitum et ad libitum*, by adopting the mode of interpretation

suggested by Prof. Stewart. These are some of the reasons why I have an unwillingness to follow him.

If the *tree* represent the old dispensation, then it will be necessary to make members of the household — servants, slaves and all — of every believer. But children, though admitted to *sprinkling*, are not allowed to partake of the eucharist, and thousands will have no connection with slave-holders — repudiating the doctrine of *property in man* — disfellowshipping all who have any part in the system, or entertain any sympathy for such. Consistency requires either that the continuity of the Abrahamic covenant in the Christian church be abandoned, or the relation between master and slave denied and disowned: else New Testament ground must be taken, *i. e.*, that religion is a *personal matter*, having no dependence on family relations or alliances. Those who repudiate "the *patriarchal institution*" must, of necessity, reject the theory under censure; for, if it was binding on the Patriarch to circumcise all "bought with his money," and baptism has come instead of the bloody rite, then it is binding on all believing owners to have their slaves baptized. The charge that masters are not so lenient as Abraham was, and that they abuse the institution, can furnish no just plea to exclude them from fellowship, without Christian dealing and discipline. Perhaps the dissevering and denunciatory measures, in one quarter, on account of the "vexed question," may lead to the discovery of the unsoundness of the theory under consideration.

Our Pedo-baptist brethren lay great stress on the fact that children were in the Old Testament church, and of course must be also in the New —custom, if nothing else, would have introduced them. But were not the Jews as much accustomed to *Priests* in the congregation as to children? But no aw nas snut out Priests; hence tney must now be in the Christian church; for you cannot oust them except by special enactment. If it be said, *ministers* have come in their stead, very well, this is clear, we find them n the church, and instructions given to them; but in which New Testament Church do we find a *single child*?

But they must have been there. A Jew, on entering the Christian church, could not live without his children; how could he live without the intervention of Priests?

But have prejudices and early education anything to do in Christ's arrangements in regard to his church? Is it to be shaped according to our ideas of propriety? Are our preconceived notions on the materials and ordinances, as we find them in the church, to be our guide? "The mother church," as she loves to be styled, has seven sacraments—priests, bishops, archbishops and a pope; but does the New Testament warrant such offices?

No fact is better established than that *faith* was a sine qua non in the new organization. The *personality* of religion is a prominent feature in the New Testament. If parents could bring their children into the Abrahamic covenant by *birth*, the New Testament opens no door into the church without *faith*. This requisition can-

not be changed to suit our peculiar notions; and hence, to reason as if they were the same, is fallacious and unsafe. The law of the land does not admit jurors, voters, witnesses, till a certain age, and with certain capacities; our fondness for our children cannot set aside the requisitions. The testimony of a mere child cannot be received in Court, though it might have been a witness to murder or o'her atrocious crime. The law cannot presume on capacity.

Under the old dispensation, religion was a more personal matter than many parents supposed. Many misunderstood the concern, and went upon the supposition that they had faith enough for the whole family; and the descendents derived the fatal inference that they were, in a great measure, irresponsible and not to blame for the obliquity of their wicked life; hence, they charged their guilt and deficiencies on their parents; the fathers had eaten sour grapes. (See Ezk. xviii.) But God assured them that the unauthorized inference, which had passed into a proverb, should no longer be used in Israel; the soul, the person, that sins, shall die; neither parental faith nor training, without personal religion, individual reliance on God could save from just punishment, the impenitent though circumcised man.

In the eleventh chapter of Romans, the Apostle is evidently contrasting, not children, incapable of faith, but moral agents, responsible for belief or unbelief—Jews and Gentiles of adult age; but infants are not even alluded to in the whole chapter. See Sec. 10.

Dr. Austin is quite certain a warrant for infant baptism is found in the commission. But *baptize and teach* cannot comprise idiots, and those unwilling to receive the ordinance or listen to instruction, nor infants, because they are not susceptible of being taught. The baptism and teaching must be restricted to the *taught*, to disciples. The first word "teach," signifies rather disciple, or make disciples—i. e. *matheteusate*, make disciples in all nations; baptizing them, the discipled, or disciples. "Baptizing *them* (*autous*) the nations." But it must be remembered that the pronoun *them* (*autous*) does not stand for nations; for *ethnos* is a *neuter noun*, but *autous* is *masculine*. The pronoun to represent *ethnos* in the accusative plural would be, not *autous*, but *auta*. The autous must refer to disciples *mathetai*, a masculine noun; grammatically, it cannot refer to *ethnos*.

Dr. Campbell quotes the several renderings of some dozen commentators on the commission.

Dr. Doddrige renders the word *matheteusate*, "*proselyte* all nations;" but Dr. Campbell says it is not in common use. Scott and Wesley render it *disciple* all nations. Wakefield, "make disciples *of all* nations." Wynne, "make disciples *in all nations*." "Make disciples," is the true meaning of *matheteuo;* but it is one thing to make disciples *in all* nations, and an other thing to *make all nations* disciples. Dr. Campbell's own rendering is, "Convert all the nations—teaching them."

Dr. Bullion, in his Greek Grammar, in regard to *autous*, says, "Sometimes, like the adjective, it takes the gender and number of a synonymous

substantive, or of one that expresses the *meaning* for which it stands; and quoting the Greek, in the commission, observes: where *autous* is put for *anthropos*, which expresses the meaning of ethna."

Anthropos, in its meaning, comprises all the *proper* subjects of the ordinance—all recognized by the New Testament; for it generally signifies *human beings*, without distinction of sex—sometimes designating man as a *masculine*, sometimes woman as a *female;* but it very seldom refers to infants. Dr. B.'s rule, then, is in point. Where men and women are contrasted, or their sex intended to be designated, *aneer*, not *anthropos*, is used for the *man*, and *gunaix* for the *woman*. (See Acts v. 14; viii. 3, 12.) But where *human beings*, without respect to sex, are mentioned, *anthropos* is used, generally: (See 2d Cor. v. 11; Gal. i. 10, 11.) "We persuade men," i. e. *human beings*, capable of being swayed by Gospel motives—"I seek to please men,"—human beings, both men and women.

Several grammarians state as rules, that sometimes, when different genders are comprised in the noun, the masculine pronoun, or adjective, because more honorable, is used. Also, that the pronouns *autous*, *ekeinos*, *tis*, &c., are often used without a substantive, the one from which it takes its gender number and case being understood.

But McKnight, in his fourth essay on translating, observes, referring to *autous*, that pronouns, in many cases, refer not to the *near*, but to the *remote* antecedent. (Luke v. 17.) The power of the Lord was present to heal (*autous*) them

not the Pharisees who are mentioned immediately before, but such sick people as were in the crowd.

But still more to our purpose, it is used, he says, to denote an antecedent, not mentioned before, but which the writer is *thinking* of *in his own mind*. Thus, 2d Peter ii. 11, *autone* them, is not put for *dignities*, mentioned in verse 10, but for the *evil angels* of which nothing is said.

In using matheteusate, the Saviour had in his mind the discipled, the converted, the proselyted by the Holy Spirit, who are to be baptized. The great business in the commission, for the disciples, was to make disciples in all nations, wheresoever they should proclaim the glad tidings; hence the effect of their labors, *mathetai*, the disciples were, doubtless, in the Saviour's mind, and he refers to them (*autous*) and not to the nations in mass—to the *ethna*, a neuter noun. If the broad unscriptural doctrine, that the Saviour intended to establish *national churches*, be assumed, it may serve a purpose, so to interpret *ethnos*, as to comprehend *all* of *every nation*, where the Gospel is introduced. This has few advocates in the United States.

But the direction is, say our opponents, "teach all nations—baptizing them," the nations, parents and children. Let us take a part of the commission as recorded by Mark xvi. 15. "Preach the Gospel to every creature." *Ktisis* here rendered *creature*, is a noun of the feminine gender. In Romans i. 20, it is rendered *creation*, in Mark x. 6, *the world*, and in Heb. ix. 20, the *building* or *tabernacle*. Now, if we must go according to their *strict construction* of the commis-

sion, we must baptize everything for which *ktisis* stands, and by which it may be translated —*the creation, the world, and the tabernacle.* If it were not wasting time, we could exhibit their *singular predilection* for *literalism*, in a more ridiculous light, by referring to other words. As only accountable beings are recognized by the New Testament, in a public profession of religion, it was not to be supposed that learned and rational men would give such an interpretation to the commission, as to require the baptism of idiots, and others just as incapable as they of understanding and performing duty. When they can produce, from the New Testament, a candidate for the ordinance, that could not "give a reason of the hope within him," it will be time enough to attend further to their fanciful theories.

Sanctified, holy—unclean, impure. (See p. 69.) So much is said on the *federal holiness* of believing parents and their capacity to impart it to their children, that something explanatory of the meaning of these terms seems necessary. The Greek *hadios* means *fitted, purposed*, destined for a particular use; *clean*, consecrated or devoted to a religious use—opposite to *dirty, nasty, filthy*. In 2 Chronicles, xxx. 17, the word is translated *sanctified*, and in the 18th *cleansed*. When applied to the Supreme Being, its signification is to *hallow*, to *honor—moral purity* is intended, when used in regard to pious persons. (See Dr. Campbell.)

It is a manner of speech derived from the Old Testament, and very much from the ceremonial

law. Peter had his Jewish prejudices, and hence was afraid to eat certain kinds of food, or to *associate* with Gentiles; but the vision convinced him that, under the new dispensation, such distinctions as had been created by the regulations among the Hebrews, were henceforth no longer to be observed. It was inadmissable for a Jew, under the old law, to marry a heathen woman, and when such unlawful connection had been formed, they were to be dissolved.

Paul had been instructed in the school of Christ, and in regard to the question that agitated the Corinthians, decided that husband or wife, being in the church, and the other party an unbeliever, was not sufficient cause to dissolve the marriage tie; though religiously improper under the Levitical law, it was not contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion.

The remarks of the Apostle must relate to children already in existence; hence *seminal* holiness could not be imparted to them according to the theory of some Pedo-baptists; so that whether the parents lived in wedlock or not, would not affect their *moral purity*. In separation the children would be neglected, and more apt to become *profane*, than if they continued in wedlock, and their education and moral training would be sadly neglected. "The children are called holy in *a civil* sense, i. e. legitimate, not spurious. (Suares and Vasques.) Melancthon gives a similar interpretation. McKnight says, "But first, it is not true, in a *federal sense*, that the unbelieving party in marriage is sanctified by the believing party." The words "are used in the idiom of the Hebrews, who, by *sanc-*

tified meant what was *fitted for a* particular use, and by *unclean*, what was unfit for use." Dr. Gill thinks the word sanctify means legitimate, and says Jerome, Ambrose, Erasmus, Camerasius, Musculus, &c., are of the same opinion. The latter writer says, "Formerly, I have abused this place against the Ana-baptists, thinking the meaning was, that the children were holy for the parent's faith; which, though true, the present place makes nothing for the purpose; and I hope that, upon reading this, every one that has abused it to such a purpose, will make the like acknowledgement; I am sure they ought."

The hypothesis that parents, though both pious, have power to communicate *holiness* to their offsprings, or reconcile them to God by *natural generation*, is overthrown by the history of ten thousand families of baptized children; they grow up enemies to God and holiness—live in iniquity and wretchedness, and die in despair. Parental influence and example are to be commended and urged by all the godly, and it is not strange, that the children of pious parents should be serious and more apt to become the heirs of salvation than those of the profane and impious. This is accomplished, not by birth, but by holy training and scriptural education: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart therefrom." But in order that the theory, that holiness is communicated by birth, be true, the child of every pious parent should be a child of grace; but as many prove to be directly the opposite, the theory destroys itself by proving too much.

(See page 69.) Dr. Barnes, of Philadelphia, agrees with Dr. Gill, and others, who make "illegitimate" as the proper meaning of "unclean," in this passage.

Dr. Dagg, of Georgia, calls attention to a fact entirely overlooked by the critics, that is, if it be proper for *believing* husband or wife to continue the marriage relation with the *unbelieving*; then *your* children are unholy, and it is improper to reside with them till they are converted. The Apostle does not say of the families where *one unbeliever* exists, that *their* children are unclean, but (*umon*) *your* children, i. e. the children of all the members of the church. The particles are, *epei ara*, otherwise, certainly are your children unholy. This is quite clear proof, that by infant baptism, the Corinthian Christians had not dedicated their children to God.

(See p. 84.) In 1636, the Baptists established in Rhode Island, a code of laws, in which, says the celebrated Judge Story, "We read, for the *first time*, since Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars, the declaration that *conscience should be free*, and men should not be punished for worshipping God in the way they were persuaded he required." From this doctaine of perfect *religious liberty*, though often urged by Massachusetts, in order to arrest and punish Quakers and others, Rhode Island has never departed.

Alluding to Roger Williams, Bancroft, the historian, observes: "He was the first in modern Christendom, to assert in its plentitude the doctrine of the *liberty of conscience*, the equality of opinions before the law, and in its defence, he

was the harbinger of Milton, the precursor and superior of Jeremy Taylor." (See his Hist. U. S. vol. i. p. 375.)

When Williams was in England, to procure a charter for Rhode Island, in 1664, the king, Charles II., declared "that he would *experiment* whether civil government could consist with such liberty of conscience." The general impression on most of the world was, that without a king to govern the civil, and a hierarch the religious concerns of earth—the two united to oppress and cheat the people out of their dearest rights—anarchy and confusion would prevail, and the world would be without government. The Rhode Island Charter was a *new thing* under the sun, and shows how far in advance of the age were the views and principles of Roger Williams. More than to any other man, are we indebted to the founder of Rhode Island, for our unrestrained religious liberties and rights of conscience.